

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XVII. No. 15 }
WHOLE No. 432 }

JULY 21, 1917

{ \$3.00 A YEAR
PRICE, 10 CENTS }

Chronicle

The War.—During the week the Germans gained a spectacular but unimportant success in Flanders. They drove back the British near the Belgian coast a third of a mile on a front of two-thirds of a mile, compelling them to retire to the west bank of the Yser River, between Lombaertzyde and St. Georges. It was thought at first that the German attack was the prelude to another effort to reach Calais, but the offensive soon spent itself without having seriously affected the general situation. Nothing else of a grave character has taken place on the western front.

Shifting their offensive in Galicia from the sector north of the Dniester to the territory which lies south of the river, the Russians crossed the Bystritsa and advancing seven miles captured Jesupol and a number of adjacent villages. About the same time they crossed the river further south, seized Ciozov and pushed forward to the Lukovitsa River. Two days later they had driven back the Austrians about fourteen miles along the south bank of the Dniester and taken possession of Halicz. The same movement carried them, further south, across the Lukovitsa and Lukva and brought them to the Lomnica. Here the Austrians attempted to stop their advance, which had now covered some twenty-five miles on a front of twenty-five miles, but finding themselves unable to do so, withdrew to the west bank of the river, where they made a desperate effort to save Kalusz, but failing in their object they abandoned the city.

Meanwhile the Russian offensive had spread south as far as the foothills of the Carpathians, and was now developing on a front of fifty miles. West of Stanislau the Russians took Novica and, further south, Perehinsko, on the Lomnica, west of Bohorodczany. In twelve days the Russians have advanced more than forty miles and have driven a salient deep into the Austrian lines with a rapidity that not only menaces their positions along the Zlota Lipa and the Carpathians but also indicates a serious disorganization of the Austrian armies. In Mesopotamia the Turks have defeated the Russians and occupied Khanikin. This means that the Russians are no longer cooperating closely with the British.

The War Revenue bill, recently reported to the Senate, has been recommitted to the Financial Committee.

This step, which was taken on the motion of Senator Simmons, Chairman of the committee, was rendered necessary because the prohibition section of the Administration Food bill automatically removed from the Revenue bill the taxes on distilled liquor by which the Financial Committee proposed raising \$400,000,000, and at the same time calls for an additional sum of more than \$200,000,000 to be expended in purchasing distilled liquor in bond. The Financial Committee has announced that revision of the Revenue bill will be delayed until final action on the prohibition question has been taken.

The Administration Food bill is at present in a serious tangle. That portion of the prohibition section, which fixes the price to be paid for the distilled liquors that the President is directed to commandeer, is now generally admitted to be unconstitutional, because it is an assumption on the part of the Legislature of an authority which belongs to the Judiciary alone. On the other hand reconsideration of the measure is impossible under parliamentary law until the bill has been committed to conference, because it was voted under a unanimous-consent agreement.

There has been manifested in the Senate a growing disinclination to extend Governmental control beyond the provisions contained in the original scope of the bill, and it is now predicted that in its present form the bill will not pass, unless the supervision be restricted to food, feed and fuel. The Senate has agreed to vote on the bill on July 21. It will then probably go to conference for revision.

On July 11 the House passed without the formality of a roll-call the Trading-with-the-Enemy bill which, confers on the President the authority to punish commercial intercourse with Germany or her allies. The purpose of the bill is to reduce to a minimum the commercial benefits which would accrue to Germany from business transacted in the United States. It provides among other things for the use in this country of patents owned by Germans. The proposed espionage features which had been appended to the bill as an amendment and which made it a criminal offense to communicate to any enemy, or ally of any enemy, in any manner, "any letter, document, writing, message, picture, diagram, map or

The War Revenue Bill

The Administration Food Bill

Trading-with-the-Enemy Bill

other device or form of communication," were stricken out of the bill before it passed.

The Administration Aviation bill, which was introduced, on July 6, in the House by Mr. Dent, Chairman of the House Military Committee, and then referred to

Aviation Bill the committee, was reported favorably on July 14 after hearings had been given to experts on the subject.

In order to facilitate its passage, it was planned at first to separate the bill calling for the creation of an air-fleet from the appropriation necessary to organize it, but discussion showed that there was practical unanimity on the matter, and when the bill came up in the House it called for an appropriation of \$640,000,000, more than one-half of which sum provides for the construction of aeroplanes and engines, and the remainder for manning the fleet, for ammunition and supplies. The personnel of the fleet will consist of about 75,000 men. The bill passed without serious opposition or material amendment and almost without debate. Broad powers are conferred on the Army Department to expedite the building and operation of the fleet, which more than any other branch of the service is expected to bring about the defeat of the German armies. Previous to this vast sum just voted \$68,000,000 had been appropriated for aviation.

In preparation for the carrying out of the selective draft, Secretary Baker announced on July 13 the number of men to be conscripted in the first drawing and the quotas to be furnished by each State. His order follows:

The Selective Draft

By virtue of the authority vested in him by an act of Congress, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the military establishment of the United States," approved May 13, 1917, the President of the United States has ordered the aggregate number of 687,000 men to be raised by draft for the military service of the United States in order to bring to full strength the organizations of the regular army and the organizations embodying the members of the National Guard drafted into the military service of the United States, and to create the national army, and has caused said aggregate number to be apportioned to the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia as set forth in the schedule hereto appended.

The quotas assigned by the President for the several States are: Alabama, 13,612; Arizona, 3,472; Arkansas, 10,267; California, 23,060; Colorado, 4,753; Connecticut, 10,977; Delaware, 1,202; District of Columbia, 929; Florida, 6,325; Georgia, 18,337; Idaho, 2,287; Illinois, 51,653; Indiana, 17,510; Iowa, 12,749; Kansas, 6,439; Kentucky, 14,236; Louisiana, 13,582; Maine, 1,821; Maryland, 7,096; Massachusetts, 20,586; Michigan, 30,291; Minnesota, 17,854; Mississippi, 10,801; Missouri, 18,660; Montana, 7,872; Nebraska, 8,185; Nevada, 1,051; New Hampshire, 1,204; New Jersey, 20,665; New Mexico, 2,292; New York, 69,241; North Carolina, 15,974; North Dakota, 5,606; Ohio, 38,773; Oklahoma, 15,564; Oregon, 717; Pennsylvania, 60,859; Rhode Island, 1,801; South Carolina, 10,081; South

Dakota, 2,717; Tennessee, 14,528; Texas, 30,545; Utah, 2,370; Vermont, 1,049; Virginia, 13,795; Washington, 7,296; West Virginia, 9,101; Wisconsin, 12,876; Wyoming, 810; Alaska, 696; Hawaii, none; Porto Rico, 12,833.

In the foregoing computation each State was given credit for the number of men it has in the National Guard and also for all those who have volunteered for the Regular Army since April 1. The Governors of the several States have been instructed to assign to each district within their State its just apportionment of the State quota. Local exemption boards to the number of 559 have been appointed by the Governors to draw up lists of those registered on June 5 in the various registration districts within their exemption district, and to assign to each name a number. The numbers on the several lists that correspond to the numbers drawn at Washington will determine the men selected for military service.

That the Government is leaving no stone unturned in its efforts to safeguard the effective prosecution of the war is being made increasingly evident with each new measure adopted at Washington. One of the chief concerns of the Administration at present is to conceal the

German Insurance Companies

movements of American shipping. To secure this the President by a proclamation dated July 14, has prohibited German insurance companies, engaged in the transaction of business in the United States, from continuing the business of marine and war risk insurance either as direct insurers or as reinsurers. All individuals, firms and insurance companies in the United States are likewise forbidden to insure or reinsure against marine and war risks with such companies. The reason given by the President for his action is that:

The nature of marine and war risk insurance is such that those conducting it must of necessity be in touch with the movement of ships and cargoes, and it has been considered by the Government of great importance that this information should not be obtained by alien enemies.

Payment on existing contracts is to be suspended during the war except in the case of vessels now at sea.

Out of the maze of conflicting reports which have obscured the situation in Germany during the past week two events of importance may be stated with certainty.

The German Crisis

The German Emperor has issued the following imperial decree:

Upon the report of my State Ministry, made to me in obedience to my decree of April 7 of the current year, I herewith decide to order a supplement to the same, that the draft of the bill dealing with the alteration of the electoral law for the House of Deputies, which is to be submitted to the Diet of the monarchy for decision, is to be drawn up on the basis of equal franchise.

The bill is to be submitted in any case early enough that the next elections may take place according to the new franchise. I charge you to make all necessary arrangements for this purpose.

(Signed) WILLIAM.

(Countersigned) BETHMANN-HOLLWEG.

In spite of its vagueness, this decree, which bears the date of July 13, promises a measure of the electoral reform which has been so insistently demanded for some months and is a step forward toward the democratization of the Empire.

As the decree, which bore the signature of Count von Bethmann-Hollweg, was a marked concession to popular demands, and as it had been repeatedly asserted that the Imperial Chancellor had the full confidence of the Kaiser, the announcement, made officially on the following day, of the resignation of the Chancellor, after eight years of uninterrupted tenure of office, came as a considerable surprise. The meeting of the German Crown Council, the first that has taken place during the war, pointed to events of a serious character; it was also generally known that the Crown Prince was out of sympathy with the Chancellor and opposed to the demanded reforms. Nevertheless, notwithstanding rumors, it was not expected that the resignation of the Chancellor would be accepted. The unexpected has actually happened, and not only has Von Bethmann-Hollweg retired but his successor, Dr. Georg Michaelis, since 1909 Under Secretary of State in the Department of Finance and since 1916 Prussian Food Controller, has been appointed in his place. The Prussian Minister of War, General von Stein, has also resigned. Count Brockdorff Rantzau has succeeded Dr. Zimmermann as Imperial Foreign Secretary. The appointment of the new Chancellor is significant, because he is a man of the people, being the first "vonless" minister to occupy the post since the German Empire was proclaimed at Versailles by William I; he is also known to hold decidedly liberal views, and as a consequence it is believed that he would not have accepted the Chancellorship unless he had received from the Kaiser pledges of his willingness to accept parliamentary reforms of a marked democratic character. No change in the Government's attitude toward the war is anticipated.

China.—General Chang Hsun's attempt to restore the Manchu dynasty has ended in failure. On July 10 he was reported to have withdrawn his troops into the Imperial City and the Temple of Heaven, the most sacred sections of Peking. This accomplished, he began to negotiate for guarantees of his personal safety. Sixty thousand Republican troops with seventy heavy guns were said to be surrounding the capital, making hopeless the dictator's escape. In response to the foreign diplomats' request that he should disarm his soldiers, General Chang declared that they feared a massacre if they laid down their arms. According to despatches that came July 12, 3,000 Monarchist troops had surrendered, fighting was going on in the forbidden city and a big fire was raging there. On July 13 it was reported that quiet had been restored in the capital after a complete Republican victory over General Chang's army.

Monarchist Movement's Collapse

He was said to have taken refuge in the Danish legation and to have declared his intention of fighting the Republicans to the end. Several of the Emperor's ministers and generals were arrested.

The Republican Government at Nanking announced the confirmation of General Feng Kou-Chang as President and Tuan Chi-Jui as Premier, according to the Constitution. It was decided to banish from Peking the Emperor and the Monarchist princes. It is hoped that the Republican movement against General Chang will unite the hitherto discordant elements in the party and give China a stable government. The question now at issue seems to be whether the military or the progressive factions are to control the country. The military governors who rule their provinces almost like dictators secured the dissolution of Parliament, but the southern Republicans will hardly allow them to hold their preponderating influence. If a compromise is successful, a new parliament may be called and another constitution may be drawn up.

News came on July 15 that Peking was occupied by the Republican forces after the surrender at Fung Tai, on July 12, of a Monarchist army of 10,000 men. General Chang Hsun's retreat in the Temple of Heaven was bombarded, his soldiers offering a desperate resistance. The dictator then made good his escape. Order has been restored in the capital, and the Republican headquarters are to be established there. On July 14 the State Department at Washington received the following communication from China's new Provisional President:

Whereas, President Li Yuan-Hung is unable, for cause, to perform the duties of his office: Now, therefore, I Feng Kuochang, do hereby proclaim to all whom it may concern that in pursuance of Article V., Section 2, of the Presidential Election law, I have, on this day of the seventh month, July 6, 1917, respectfully taken up the duties of the office of the President of the Republic.

On July 16 the situation in Peking was reported to be "entirely quiet."

Ireland.—The *Irish Weekly Independent* notes that in the last two years there has been an immense decrease in the number of Irish emigrants. In 1895 48,703 men, women and children left Ireland for foreign shores; in 1915 there were but 10,659 emigrants; in 1916, 7,302.

Emigration

The total for the first five months of last year was 2,146, made up of 845 males and 1,301 females. The total for the first five months of this year was 1,265, made up of 525 males and 740 females.

This means a net decrease of 1,265 emigrants this year compared with the corresponding period of last year. There is a decrease in the number from each province as follows: Leinster, 136; Munster, 165; Ulster, 633, and Connaught, 331. It is further interesting to note that considerably fewer emigrants left Irish ports this year for England, Scotland, and Wales. Comparing the figures for the first five months of this year with the corresponding period of last year, we note a fall from 1,294 to 749, a decrease of 545.

This would be hopeful news, were it not for the fact that the war is now working more injury to Ireland than emigration did in the past.

The election to Parliament of a Sinn Feiner, Edward de Valera, a leader in the Easter insurrection and very recently a prisoner in an English jail, has caused a commotion both in Ireland and in England. De Valera stood for East Clare, vacated by the death of Major Redmond, and was elected by nearly 3,000 majority over the Nationalist candidate, Patrick Lynch, sometime Crown Prosecutor. The victory of Sinn Fein is all the more significant, because, a short time ago, East Clare was a Nationalist stronghold. Added significance is had in the fact that De Valera, who was born in New York of an Irish mother and a Spanish father, adopted the program of Easter week, 1916, as his platform and invited the electors to vote for an Irish republic of sovereign and absolute independence. According to Unionist and Liberal papers this election will probably wreck the Nationalist party and will nullify the work of the Convention. In their opinion Ireland has spoken, through East Clare, for absolute freedom, in repudiation of Mr. Redmond's program. A Dublin dispatch says:

It is believed here that the result of the East Clare election will interfere with the arrangement for the assembling of the Irish Convention, as it is considered to represent a feeling of lack of confidence in the good faith of the Coalition Government and a belief that the Irish party went too far in its consideration of the Government's war difficulties and received no adequate recognition of the party's reasonable attitude.

The Dublin correspondent of the *Times* declares that the Government must deal with a new and powerful party, for "It is probable that no Nationalist seat in the House is now safe outside Dublin, and perhaps not even there." The *Daily Chronicle*, forgetful that England is also participating in American gold, asserts that Sinn Fein is moving to success by means of American money. The *Daily Telegraph* remarks that the Irish members of Parliament, of every shade of political opinion, agree that the East Clare election has both discredited the Nationalist party and made clear to all that the only way to settle the Irish trouble is to establish an Irish republic. The London *Times* comments as follows:

The program of the successful party is quite frankly revolutionary, anti-English and separatist. There is not and never can be the slightest question either among Englishmen or among serious Irishmen of accepting the wild program with which the new member and his friends have won their seats in Parliament.

There is all the more reason therefore why the best elements in Ireland should go forward and review the situation together with a determination to agree. If they should fail the responsibility for good government will remain where it is today. To refuse the effort at this day would be the counsel of sheer despair.

The *Daily Independent* of Dublin thinks "Five out of every six electors who supported the victor did so out of sheer disgust for the cringing, crawling policy of the

Irish party and the blundering tactics of their leaders." According to the pro-British *Irish Times*,

The Sinn Fein policy, so far, has developed on destruction and bitterness pregnant with menace to the peace of Ireland, yet this policy triumphed over the memory of a devoted soldier and swept the Nationalists out of a seat held without opposition for twenty years.

The *Express* is of the opinion that the election is the most portentous thing in modern Irish political history, and believes that the "Nationalists can do little at the Convention but record their pious opinions."

Russia.—On July 12 the Finnish Diet passed the second reading of a bill which virtually establishes the country's independence. It was planned to put the

Finland's Independence

measure into force "by simple declaration," that is to say, without Russia's sanction. The act would be a formal denial of Russia's sovereign rights over Finland. The new law, which the Socialists are chiefly responsible for, proclaims that Russia has lost all authority in Finland, except in the army, the navy and in the field of diplomacy. All other privileges of the Grand Dukes of Finland are now claimed for the Finnish Diet, which assumes the right to execute the law, to convoke and prorogue the legislature, and to appoint a supreme executive. The Governor-General is practically superseded. M. Tokoi, Vice-President of the Department of Economics of the Finnish Diet, declared that the projected Finnish war-loan might be raised if a guarantee were given that it would not be used to further imperialistic designs but only to meet the expenses arising from the revolution and from the support of the Russian garrison. He also declared:

We make no claims in the domain of foreign policy or of war, and we do not desire any change in our relations with Russia until the end of the war, but we must immediately receive internal autonomy, which should be guaranteed internationally after the war.

Finland's move has caused considerable disquiet in Petrograd. C. Tcheipse, President of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates, went to Helsingfors, the capital of Finland, in the hope of settling the differences with Russia, and Premier Lvoff summoned home the Cabinet Ministers who were with the army. The Premier's Socialist colleagues say that in principle they sympathize with Finland's move, but M. Lvoff and the other Ministers maintain that Finland must defer action till the Constituent Assembly meets. The Ukraine, a district composed of several large provinces in southern Russia, is also reported to be working out statutes for autonomy without waiting for the meeting of the Constituent Assembly. The Ukrainian National Assembly explains, however, that it does not desire separation of the district from Russia, and in Petrograd a compromise was hoped for which would also satisfy Finnish demands, thus avoiding severing the country from Russia.

Simplicity and Complexity in Religion

J. D. TIBBITS

IT has been frequently alleged as an argument against Catholic theology that by it the approach to religion is made by far too difficult and too technical. Those who make this allegation are never tired of drawing a vivid contrast between what they conceive to be the extreme simplicity of the Gospel story and the highly developed system which characterizes the Church. As illustrating this disparity they urge that St. Paul with all his depth and skill in dialectic would have found the "*Summa*" of St. Thomas quite beyond him, while St. Peter would not only have been incapable of producing the Encyclical "*Pascendi*," but would have been equally incapable of understanding it.

It is admitted, of course, that what these critics are pleased to call "scholastic Protestantism," fell into the same error. The Thirty-nine Articles, though there is an element about them not wholly unchildish, were certainly not addressed to children. The more logical Westminster Confession was yet far beyond the man in the street. And though the Oxford movement made so strong an appeal to primitive sources, it must needs make its prospective converts, to some extent at least, theologians, historians, antiquarians, mystics and esthetes, before it can conduct them, with anything approaching adequacy, to the threshold of the Faith.

It is true that the New Theology has addressed itself to the problem of reducing Christianity to its lowest terms. It has succeeded only in reducing it to its lowest depths. It began by annihilating dogma, because dogma demanded explanation. It has ended by annihilating reason, because reason demanded dogma. So learned a man as the late Dr. James D. Martineau expended much labor and erudition in the attempt to show that early Christianity was a very simple affair. It is, however, by no means a simple affair to read Dr. Martineau's books, and there is always the feeling that the approach to so simple a thing, as he conceives it, should be just a little less complicated than he has apparently been able to make it.

Writers of this class, who aspire to become the efficiency experts of theology, appear to be quite forgetful of one important fact, and that is that the simplest and most evident propositions become complicated the moment they are made the objects of speculation. Thus, such fundamental truths as the existence of the material universe or the freedom of the will, are sometimes doubted or even denied by thinkers of certain schools. But they are doubted or denied as objects of speculation only. No one doubts them in real life. The determinist is as quick to appeal to the courts, and to employ the best counsel as other men. The idealist, despite his ideal-

ism, raises his umbrella when it rains. There is a manifest inconsistency between thought and action. Yet those men are the very first to ridicule scholastic philosophy because of its complication. That it is complex is obvious enough, but it is equally obvious that not only can I perform no rational act, but that it is impossible for me to engage in the simplest business transaction without assuming the fundamental truths upon which scholastic philosophy rests. I may, however, be very successful in business, and at the same time a very poor philosopher. It is not at all necessary that I should be both, any more than it is necessary that I be a theologian in order to be a Christian. But to reject the notion of substances and causes because a whole literature has arisen to explain them, is as absurd as to reject grace and the Sacraments because they cannot be reduced to a formula.

It has been pointed out that Mr. Sunday's scheme of religion, though quite at variance with that of the new theologians, is, in this respect far more successful; and that by him the intellectual process is at a very minimum. This may, in a way, be true, but it is to be remembered that those who surrender themselves to Mr. Sunday's eloquence, are carried over all possible stumbling-blocks on a wave of emotion; and emotion, whatever else it may be, is not speculative. And even when Mr. Sunday is drawn into conflict with opinions radically different from his own, his method seems to be to meet them with ridicule and with indignation. He hurls invectives at the higher critics and scorn at the evolutionists. To sit in judgment upon him is far from my thought; but it is of interest to note how impossible it is for him to isolate his faith from opinions which do have bearings upon it. It may please him better to dismiss them with a phrase of slang than with a scientific treatise; but his very method is proof of the problem which presses upon him, and proof, too, that his faith is not quite so simple as he would have it seem.

The truth is, that to reduce religion to a formula is to empty it of its content; and to empty it of its content is to destroy its vitality. A very great part of the value of religion lies in its power to affect individuals. To crystallize it into an abstract sentence such as, "the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man," or "the life for others," is simply to limit its application to the taste. And although with some it might become an impelling power, it is perfectly evident that with none could it ever become a constraining power. It might make good men better. It has no means at its disposal for making bad men good.

But is it true that the complexity of the Catholic system is a stumbling-block to those who are within her pale

as well as to those who are at her threshold? Paradoxical as it may sound, the fact appears to be that it is because of this very complexity that she is possessed of a simplicity and directness which is found in no other religion. A striking illustration of this occurred many years ago in my own experience. A moral question presented itself to me in the course of a legal transaction. I was forced to act in one of two ways, and whichever way I might choose seemed to work injustice to some one. I naturally consulted a priest as to what my duty was. I received not only a direct reply, but the most conclusive reasons for it, all of which was so very convincing as to make me wonder that it had not already occurred to me. From mere curiosity I propounded the same problems to a number of Protestant theological students, and to at least one Protestant minister. In nearly every instance the answer was wrong, and in every instance the reasoning. The contrast impressed me not

a little. Here was the Catholic Church with her complicated system of dogma, reducing a concrete problem to the utmost simplicity, and there, on the other hand, were the disciples of theological simplicity rendering the same problem more complicated than the whole Catholic system itself. And as with morals, so with all religious truth. To attempt to sum it up in however concise a sentence is to make its concrete application impossible; and as, after all, men are to be saved in the concrete, it is the concrete that counts.

Whatever, then, this school of theology may gain by its sweeping economy of intellectual effort, is more than offset by its wholesale sacrifice of the definite and the tangible. Its value lies chiefly in its unwitting demonstration that the advantage of knowing one's own mind is as true of religions as of individuals; and in its striking illustration of the fact that ambiguity is not necessarily synonymous with efficiency.

An Air Raid on London

A. HILLIARD ATTERIDGE

I DO not know what account of the noon-day air raid on London, on June 13, has appeared in the American press. Judging from reports I have seen of the earlier Zeppelin raids, in American newspapers, I imagine that the natural desire of the newspaper man to write "a good story" has led to extravagant accounts of damage done. I visited some of the districts that had been attacked, immediately after the raid, and while the ambulances were still removing the wounded. These attacks, whether by night or day, have sufficiently horrible results. But it is easy to exaggerate them. Considering that London with its suburbs covers an area of at least 150 square miles, with some open spaces, but is mostly a closely-built and densely-inhabited mass of great towns that have grown together into a huge capital, the marvel is that the damage was relatively so small. A few fires were started which were immediately extinguished. A few buildings were damaged, most of them slightly; a good deal of glass was broken in the immediate neighborhood of the explosions. Out of a population of 6,000,000, there were about 100 deaths, that is about one in 60,000. In no case was any damage done to factories or warehouses, or to any establishment that could be described as having a military character. So far as material results go, the raid was a futile performance. The aeroplanes engaged and the explosives they used represent valuable war material which might have been employed with some effect on the fighting fronts, but were in this case used to damage a school and a few shops, and kill and wound a number of civilians.

The only imaginable way in which the attack could be

considered to have any bearing on the war would be as an effort to produce what is described as "moral effect." Besieged towns are sometimes bombarded in order to terrify the inhabitants into forcing the military commandant to surrender. But such bombardments are a continuous shelling, day and night, of people crowded together into a small space. Even so, they are generally ineffective, and no besieger ever yet expected to force a surrender by throwing a few shells into a place in a bombardment lasting for about ten minutes. This is what the air raid amounted to. As to its effect on the Londoners, there was certainly no panic, and after it was over, the general feeling was simply one of mere irritation against the enemy. In the days before compulsory service was introduced, every Zeppelin raid on London was followed by a rush to the recruiting offices. Instead of making people more anxious for peace, such outrages are powerful stimulants to the war-spirit. There is evidence of this in the talk, sometimes very wild talk, about reprisals of the same kind against German cities. So far our Government has resisted this outcry, and wisely perseveres in the policy of using our splendid air corps for serious military operations on the fighting front.

Aerial bombardment is one of the ugly novelties of war rendered possible by the development of aircraft in the last ten years. Long before this development took place, attempts had been made to use the old drifting balloons for the purpose. Thus as early as 1849 the Austrians used drifting balloons to bombard Venice during the insurrection of that year. They gave up the

practice when they found the balloon had an awkward trick of drifting back sometimes and dropping its bombs on their own lines. But even under modern conditions, effective aerial bombardment is an extremely difficult operation, so difficult that the game is hardly worth the candle. In the second year of the war it seemed for a while that the Zeppelin might be effectively used in this way at night. It flew high enough to be fairly safe from anti-aircraft guns, and it could carry a considerable load of high explosives. It had the further advantage that, with stopped engines, it could drift slowly over the place attacked. At first it was supposed that in the darkness it was fairly safe from aeroplane attack, and that the division of the balloon into a number of separate compartments secured it against being brought down by machine-gun fire, even if an aeroplane attacked it. But the Zeppelin ceased to be a serious means of attack and Zeppelin after Zeppelin was brought down in a mass of flames. The Zeppelin has still its uses for scouting purposes, but in a bombarding raid it is a greater danger to its own crew than to the place it tries to attack. This is a solid gain, not only for the Allies in the war, but for the world generally. It makes these horrible night attacks all but obsolete, and one may safely predict that they will play no part in the war of the future.

But what about attacks by aeroplanes in the daylight? Here again, the difficulties of the attack have increased enormously since the war began. Anti-aircraft guns and gunnery have been so improved that the aeroplane must fly at a great height. In the days before the war at flying exhibitions there were bomb-dropping competitions. A target was marked out on the ground and the airmen dropped dummy bombs upon it. They made very fair practice, but they flew at a height of only 500 or 600 feet. To fly at this height in war would be to court destruction. The improvement in anti-aircraft guns has forced the airmen to fly higher and higher. In the attack on London the German aeroplanes were at least two miles above the city, perhaps higher. Their engines could be heard, but they looked like mere specks in the sky. They kept at this height, not only to avoid gun-fire but also to diminish the chance of attack by British aeroplanes. An airman takes some time to climb to the height of two miles in the air, and this would give the enemy a better chance of getting away without having to fight. But flying at two miles height means that the aeroplane can carry only a reduced quantity of bombs, and anything like aiming is out of the question. The bombs are dropped with a remote chance of hitting something it is worth while to destroy. The probability is that the bomb will imperil only civilian life and property. From a moral point of view, this is one of the reasons why such attacks should be ruled out of the permissible weapons of honorable warfare. In a bombardment by the ordinary methods of naval and land warfare it is quite legitimate to take the risk of *accidentally* killing a few civilians, while destroying an enemy's bat-

teries, arsenals, etc., or shelling his troops. But no honorable soldier or sailor would order fire to be opened where the chance of doing effective military damage was *remote*, and there was a *practical certainty* that numbers of civilians would lose their lives. But this latter is the condition of aeroplane bombardment from a great height. It is for the honor of the British Air Corps that in their raids on German arsenals, depots, etc., and railway junctions behind the front, they always take the risk of flying low, for the purpose of confining the attack to its military object and avoiding as far as possible damage to the civil population. This may mean the loss of some of our aircraft, but the risk is chivalrously taken by our airmen.

But to do this over a well-defined center of population with anti-aircraft guns mounted and aeroplanes ready to ascend, would mean the certain destruction of the attacking force. So, in a raid on a great city, the airmen must fly at such a height that the chance of a useful result from a military point of view is a small one, and the operation is costly, even if no aeroplanes are destroyed by the defense. Costly explosives are largely wasted without result, and the aircraft themselves are injured by the prolonged flight at a high altitude. The life of an aeroplane is about three months under ordinary conditions; after that, it has to be scrapped, or reconstructed. To sum up, the conditions are such that material damage in a military point of view depends on a mere chance, and the so-called moral effect of producing panic and the desire for a patched-up peace is not produced, but, on the contrary, air raids seem to produce the opposite effect, and at the same time it must be noted that such raids mean the withdrawal of airmen and aircraft from the fighting zone where they have a real possibility of seriously affecting the course of the operations.

These considerations suggest the prospect that air raids directed against great centers of population outside the actual fighting zone, may be, sooner or later, recognized as things to be relegated to the class of the obsolete barbarities of war. The argument that they are, from the military point of view, bad policy is likely to prove more effective in this direction than humanitarian considerations. At the Hague Conference of 1899, when aerial navigation was still little more than a dream, it was agreed that the dropping of bombs from balloons should be vetoed for a term of years to come. At the second Conference, in 1907, when the dirigible balloons and the aeroplane had been invented, an attempt was made to renew the prohibition. All that was agreed was that "the bombardment by any means whatever" of undefended towns, villages, etc., should be forbidden. But this was accepted only by about half the Powers represented, amongst them, the United States, Great Britain and Austria. But France, Russia, Germany and Italy did not sign the agreement, and the very words of the Convention made it ineffective, in case of

a war in which a non-signatory Power was engaged. And at the same time, the word "undefended" was given such a restricted sense as to make the agreement almost useless. Thus it was laid down that the mere existence in a town of factories and stores that could be used for the service of an army or navy, brought it into the class of "defended" places, and laid it open to bombardment. It is clear that even if the Hague Conventions were strictly observed, they would afford little protection against this new horror of war.

The best hope for its abolition lies in its being so very difficult to carry out a really effective aerial bombardment. It is a gain to the world that during the war the powers of defense against it have so rapidly increased as already to have made night bombardments all but impossible, and severely to handicap aeroplane attacks by day. Once it is recognized that such attacks are more costly to the attacking force than dangerous to the place attacked, there will be a prospect of a Convention for their abolition being not only signed by the Powers, but also observed in the wars of the future.

War's Witness to Christianity

F. A. FADDEN

THE world presents an unusual and inspiring spectacle as a result of war; on all sides there is a widespread, spontaneous readiness to sacrifice. Calamity which ever discloses unsuspected possibilities has opened the treasures of the world, not treasures of gold, these are mere coincidents, but treasures of manhood and character. The world-war has given us a glimpse into the souls of men, and what we have seen there reassures us that men at their best recognize the existence of things greater than the world, that when the climax comes they are ready to accept the world only for what it is, a stepping-stone to higher things.

It is not always that we find the majority of men at their best. The normal condition which confronts us is different. Life's by-paths frequently lead men far afield from eternal truths and from the essentials of manhood. When sacrifice results from absolutely free choice, sacrifice is often discarded. Hence religion frequently pleads in vain. Religion is antagonistic to low interests. Men do not want it, not because they do not recognize its worth, but because they are not willing to pay the price it exacts, self-sacrifice. But men as a class, just as each man individually, eventually come face to face with dreadful reality. When they do, they usually meet the crisis with calmness and dignity. Big issues make big men, or rather prove that men are always more than they appear, great creatures, God's creatures, superior to time or materiality. The eternal spark flares up on the threshold of eternity. Inevitably, impending death finds most men resigned to die. This is the ultimate triumph of the soul. It is the victory of eternity. It is an open and practical and undeniable confession that

men belong to another world and that they are willing when the time comes to go where they belong.

When the time comes! Living under a sudden and unexpected strain, our generation has been thrown unmistakably against the inevitable climax of time, the impending possibility of relinquishing all that it has for something which it apprehends as dearer than itself. We are facing demands upon our resources, our very lives perhaps, demands the full meaning of which we do not completely understand because we have never experienced them before. This dreadful business of war, the unbending sacrifices it entails, the prospect of bloodshed and death, these things are all so new and so terrible than we can scarcely realize that they are here. Our common life hitherto has been so even and sustained, its pleasures and pains so usual and expected from time to time, that the prospect of a disaster like a world-conflict staggers us. We have read of such things in history, but after all we have been as men delightfully apart from history. We have heard of bravery and chivalry in years gone by, we have thrilled over distant battles and saddened at the picture of devastated battlefields. In the world's long story we have seen nations crumble and their successors arise, we have seen civilizations flourish and decay, we have seen many die that many might live, but it has all been like wonderland to us. Our day has been a ceaseless blossoming of tranquillity. We are like rich children to whom successful parents have left an inheritance of ease, and, as children, we have playfully hoped to pass through life and never feel the touch of those great issues which have stirred men's hearts in the past and which will stir them over and over again until the end of time. We have wondered what life would bring as we progressed, and in a flash we have found ourselves face to face with the sternest reality of life, the prospect of losing it and losing it while we are still apparently secure in the strength and vigor of manhood. How could we have hoped to escape this? How could we have hoped to slip through life and never feel the pressure of that law of sacrifice which superintends the development of all life? The day of universal peace has not dawned. There can be no universal peace here in the sense in which men childishly crave it. Nature heals quickly, it is true, but this is the process of the education of nature. There is virtue in a scar. Why, it is only a few years since our Civil War, and men now so foolishly refer war to the Middle Ages. There will be war while man is what he is, a creature to be tried, to be educated, to be developed, a creature whose mission it is to pass through the ashes of life and time to the bosom of God in eternity.

So we are quickly making up our minds. Manhood is stronger still than all the material charms which make life so attractive. This generation no longer looks upon itself as a child. It is now a man and the eternal problem of manhood is vividly before it. Varied and con-

flicting emotions crowd our souls as we take up this task of proving our manhood. The true meaning of life on earth, with its joys and sorrows, is beginning to dawn upon us. The Way of the Cross shines with a new and fruitful light now, as we recognize in our own hearts a conscious intuition of the sublime mystery behind it. We are learning to think, we are learning to love, we are learning to sacrifice. Christ is right, the Martyrs are right, the Church is right. There is but one way to live and men at their best openly confess it. "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world, keepeth it unto life eternal."

With the increasing realization in men's minds today of the necessity of adhering strictly to Christian principles it is incredible that some should blame the horrors of war on the presumed failure of those very principles. In certain quarters it is loudly proclaimed that Christianity has not stood the test and war is advanced to prove it. Once again Christ is brought to judgment, the verdict has been rendered and the dirge is about to be chanted. Christianity has failed and the predominating laws of our life and civilization must be readjusted. When the bloodshed is over and men, weary of carnage, settle down again to the more profitable and more human occupation of living, the change will be effected. So goes the unending argument of every age.

Whatever of falsehood and sham the wayward impulses of men may have led them at various times to accept, it is certain that today, when they are at their best, no open fallacy can flourish amongst them. Their actions now constitute the test of Christianity's failure or success. There are some in the world who will not believe the judgment of God; if not, let them believe the judgment of men, of the majority of men. God told us years ago what was best for the world and today men of their free choice are telling us exactly the same thing. God instituted Christianity to superintend the growth and development of human nature. Even unto eternal

happiness He knew the needs of man, his possibilities, his end. He knew better than man that he thrives best who seeks the least to gratify himself. Growth bespeaks cultivation, attention, application, stern discipline over self. Where men allow their selfish interests to predominate, where pleasure and personal profit overrule the law, there is no real advancement, there is only decay. Christianity with its insistence on sacrifice, its training in sacrifice, the relinquishing of everything, if need be, for the sake of Christ, brings out the best that is in men. That is why the best that is in men testifies in turn to the undying truths of Christianity. Human nature itself cries out in witness to the wisdom of God who created it and knows it better than it knows itself. It may seem almost irreverent to say that the judgment of men can confirm the judgment of God, yet that is the situation at this moment. The truth of Christianity is exemplified on all sides by men of every creed, of varied education, of countless walks of life. In the presence of the great crisis men recognize the process, the only process, through which the world can improve. The State is preaching the necessity of sacrifice, the Red Cross is preaching the necessity of sacrifice, everywhere we hear the same encouraging cry. There is a reason for man relinquishing his oxen, his farm, his wife, if need be, for the sake of a great cause. The grain of wheat must die to bring forth fruit.

If Christianity has failed, what then can supplant it? God knew what He was doing when He instituted it. Men today prove by their actions in the presence of the emergencies of war that God knew what He was doing when He instituted it. Whether we appeal to God or to man we are confronted with the same fact, true manhood is attained only through self-sacrifice. To the task of living and dying in this Christian faith, then, let men devote, with renewed confidence, all their energies. There are worse things than war. No one ever reached Paradise through peace with dishonor.

The Y. M. C. A., the K. of C. and the President

EDWARD F. GARESCHÉ, S.J.

IN our last article we alluded to the report that the President had extended to the Knights of Columbus the same official approval as an agency for work among the soldiers as he had formerly given to the Young Men's Christian Association. This is entirely in accord with the best traditions of the nation, and it serves to strengthen the contention that the Government of the United States has the right and, to some extent, the responsibility to pay for service wherever it finds it, irrespective of the fact that the organization or individual who offers the service is consecrated to this or that relig-

ious denomination. It may be profitable at this juncture to say a word more on this question, made timely by the approval of religious societies for service in war-time. Some of our religious institutions are giving valuable help both to the State and national Governments in so many ways, and it is such a burden on our people to support at once public institutions by taxes and religious institutions by voluntary contributions, that if the States and the nation ought to pay for the service of the religious institutions, it were well to bring out the principle as clearly as possible. Besides, Government assistance would

make for the greater efficiency of the religious institutions themselves, and thus directly benefit the commonwealth.

Two distinctions should be clear from the beginning. First we mean merely to establish the principle, not to urge in all cases its practical application. It must rest with the Hierarchy and with the superiors of religious establishments to decide whether in this or that case application should be made for aid from the Government. Secondly, in the brief space of this article, we do not mean to treat of existing legislation or of constitutional provisions in the various States themselves. We shall attempt to indicate only the spirit of our national Constitution and the attitude of our commonwealth. Local legislation and the Constitution of individual States may be changed, and they should be changed wherever they are not in accord with the general principles of our Government.

We have quoted, in a previous article, the provision of the Constitution concerning freedom of religious worship: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This provision, it will be observed, is prohibitory, and designed to protect the interests of religion by ensuring its free exercise according to each man's conscience. In the case of *Reynolds vs. U. S.* (98 U. S. pp. 162-164), Mr. Chief Justice Waite gives an interesting sketch of the historical development of this principle, in which he shows that before the adoption of the Constitution efforts were made in some of the colonies and States to legislate "not only in respect to the establishment of religion, but in respect to its doctrines and precepts as well. The people were taxed against their will for the support of religion and sometimes for the support of particular sects to whose tenets they could not and did not subscribe." It was for the protection of the people against such efforts, and to ensure freedom of worship that the Constitutional Amendment above quoted was inserted, and by it, in the words of Mr. Jefferson, "Congress was deprived of all legislative power over mere opinion." But the attitude of the Government as fixed in this provision and in the decisions of the courts interpreting it, is to be one not of neglect, still less of hostility toward religion. It may rather be described as an attitude of benevolent impartiality. "All religions are tolerated" says Judge Caldwell, in the case of *Swann vs. Swann* (21 Fed. 299) quoting from other decisions, "and none is established. Each has an equal right to the protection of the law, whether Christians, Jews or infidels. . . . The State protects all religions but espouses none."

It is further clear from the decisions, that it is the spirit of our commonwealth to favor and help religion in general, while maintaining a strict impartiality among the various forms. While the law does not enforce religious duties and obligations as such," the Judge continues in the decision above cited, "it has a tender regard for the

conscience and convenience of every citizen in all matters relating to his religious faith and practice." "The State protects all religions." Not an attitude of severe and studied indifference, but a careful and friendly impartiality is indicated in these decisions as the proper attitude of our Government toward religious organizations. To favor religion wherever it is possible without violating the strict impartiality enjoined on the Government by the Constitution, is moreover the part of reason and of common sense. Our nation is not an irreligious nation. In the public documents, in the prayers which open every session of Congress, in the appointing of chaplains both in the army and navy, in the motto on our very coins "In God We Trust," in the language used in the proclamations of our Chief Executive, and in the dealings of our Government in general, the disposition has always been plain to favor and protect religious practice. It is the spirit of the American Constitution and of our commonwealth to favor whatever promotes the worship of God, but in such a way as to show no partiality for one religion over the other. No one who studies the official documents of the nation and the decisions of the courts can reasonably judge otherwise.

It is therefore the true spirit of the American Government to pay for services received by it from religious organizations, wherever such service is of a character for which the Government is in general authorized to pay. Moreover the beneficent disposition of our country toward religion would rather incline it to show especial favor to religious organizations, not as to distinct denominations, but as to an influence which makes mightily for good citizenship and sound morals. It is timely to emphasize this principle, so strongly brought out in the recent action of the President in approving the Y. M. C. A. and the Knights of Columbus. And it would be extremely desirable that the Government should extend the practical workings of the principle to other fields of action as well. Aside from the question whether they wish this sort of help or not, the spirit of our American institutions is in favor, for example, of rewarding the Catholic Indian schools for their splendid services to the Government in taking care of its charges. The same may be said of similar services rendered to the Government by other Catholic organizations. They should be recompensed in kind, not as coming from any particular denomination, for that would be in contravention of the spirit of the Constitution, but as being a definite and valuable service rendered the Government, and as tending, from their connection with religion in general, to strengthen good citizenship and fortify public morals.

Since our State and city governments are in great part modeled on the national, and are an application of the same principles of equity and democracy, it is to be expected that they also in their dealings with religious institutions, should carry out the same fair and just policy indicated in the President's action toward the Y. M. C. A. and the Knights of Columbus. Where serv-

ice appreciable in money is rendered the city or State, and which the State or city would otherwise have to pay for from the public funds, it is only right and proper that the religious institution rendering the service should be recompensed and rewarded, not indeed as a denominational body, but as a servant of the State or city, doing that which is deserving of a material reward. The accidental circumstance that the institution rendering this service is of a religious character should rather be an argument in favor of granting payment for services rendered, since our Government, while maintaining an attitude of strict and beneficent impartiality, yet favors religion as such, and is desirous that all its citizens should have opportunity and encouragement to do their duty to God. We should stand squarely on this principle and emphasize it strongly at this time.

Many of our Sisters, for example the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, are taking care of the wards of the city in great numbers. Not only are they not rewarded for this, but in many places they are actually taxed and made to bear the double burden of caring for these public charges, and of paying taxes on the very property used to lodge them. We do not claim for these institutions any help or subsidies on the ground of their religious character, but we do maintain, and most earnestly, that the valuable services they render the State or city should be recompensed in kind, and that the unfortunate and un-American discrimination made against them on the ground of their religious character should be done away with.

One may repeat literally on this subject the announcement of the President as stated in his decree concerning the Y. M. C. A. They are "prepared by experience, approved methods, and assured resources, to serve especially" and to help the wards of the State or the city. "It seems best for the interest of the service that" they shall "continue as a voluntary civilian organization; however the results obtained are so beneficial and bear such a direct relation to efficiency, inasmuch as their activities contribute to the happiness, contentment and morale" of the city's charges, that "official recognition should be given" to these organizations as a "valuable adjunct and asset" to the service of the State or city or nation.

At this momentous time the President of the United States, by his official action, has once more confirmed the principle we are striving to establish. May the enlightened intelligence of our public officials carry this equitable, patriotic, and thoroughly American principle into every department of the national, State and city government!

Suggestions for Church Music

HAROLD BECKET GIBBS, MUS.DOC.

THE "reestablishment" of the Gregorian Chant and the "restoration" of the Polyphonic Schools of Church Music are the two great ideals set by Pius X. No choir which has not been raised on the Gregorian Chant can ever expect to give

convincing interpretations of polyphony. As in the Chant, so in this kind of music, individuality must be eliminated and a choir that has been singing the Chant for one year or more, and that exclusively, can now enter the realms of polyphony with perfect security. Whilst there are many great composers of this music of many melodies, the Holy Father mentions the great "Prince of Sacred Music," Palestrina, as bringing it to "its highest perfection." Many appreciations have been expressed of the works of this great master, one of the "Seven Lamps" of Music, but those of Rockstro and Wagner are probably the best. The former says:

It is difficult to form a just idea of this most perfect music, without hearing it actually sung, as Palestrina himself intended it to be sung, by a tolerably numerous choir of unaccompanied voices. The amount of learning displayed in its construction is almost incredible; yet, the effect produced upon the hearer is that of extreme simplicity. The reason of this is obvious. Ingenuity and learning are everywhere made subservient to beauty of expression; and beauty of expression, to devotional feeling.

The latter declares:

Here the rhythmus is only perceptible through the interchange of chord successions, while it does not exist as symmetrical divisions of time. The time divisions are so intimately bound up with the essence of harmony, which, in itself, is timeless, that the laws of time are of no assistance for understanding this kind of music. The single time-division only shows itself as the most delicate variation of a primary harmonic color, which is displayed to us through the most varied progressions, without our being able to perceive any sign of fixed lines in the changes. And since this harmonic color is not contained in a given space of time, we obtain, as it were, a timeless and spaceless picture, an entirely spiritual revelation, through which we are affected with indescribable emotion, since it represents to us more clearly than anything else, the inmost essence of religion, free from all dogmatic ideas.

The difficulties of Palestrina and his contemporaries have been greatly exaggerated. Each part must be learned separately and practised separately, for each is a complete melody in itself and is consequently full of melodic interest. Even when he writes in the harmonic style he does so melodiously, and one cannot fail to observe that all these great men, including the classic trio of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven, three more of the "Seven Lamps" of Music, studied counterpoint thoroughly and were in consequence immediate masters of the lesser science of harmony, as we now use that term. Nowadays we teach that art which had its birth many centuries later as the foundation of composition, and the greater art comes as an afterthought. If counterpoint were thoroughly taught in the first instance, it is doubtful if harmony would cause the slightest trouble, for the former begets the latter. Witness the ease with which the classic masters pass from the polyphonic to the monophonic styles, and Palestrina is as easy and attractive in a series of simple chord successions as in his more elaborate flights. Most churches possess "the requisite means" for the performance of polyphony, and all that is required is a willingness to study and practise this much-neglected style of music.

The third and last species of music to be employed in Divine worship is referred to as follows:

As modern music is principally consecrated to secular matters, the greatest care must be exercised in admitting only those compositions into the church, which contain nothing secular, which are not reminiscent of motives employed in the theater, and which are not composed, even in their outward forms, on the model of secular forms.

As the Chant gave birth to polyphony, so polyphony has given birth to that style of composition known as the polyodic school where the voice parts are written after the polyphonic style but with an independent organ accompaniment, which makes an extremely attractive type of church music much to

be commended. From Viadana to the present day there have been composers who have given such treasures to the Church.

As to other types of modern compositions it is safe to say that as counterpoint is the oxygen of harmony, so a work which is entirely devoid of contrapuntal effects is one which soon wears out. A choir should be careful to build up a repertoire of those compositions which are beautiful, and as we are assured that "A thing of beauty is a joy for ever" so we shall never tire of those works which possess the essential features of a healthy immortality. Besides, the frequent repetition of beautiful music is bound to have an educational effect upon the worshipers, and, in course of time the atmosphere of our churches will be fraught with that devotion which is as clinging to the soul as the imprisoned odor of incense and wax is to the olfactory sense. There is scarcely any need to do more than mention the emphasis that is given to the exclusive use of the Latin language at all liturgical functions. There must be no "alteration or transposition of words," no "undue repetitions," no "suppression of syllables, and always in a manner intelligible to the Faithful, who are present."

When sung to figured music the ordinary parts of the Mass "ought to exhibit unity of composition" and "it is therefore forbidden to compose them as separate pieces, with the result that each of these separate pieces forms a musical composition in itself, which can be detached from the rest or replaced by another." It is generally admitted that "patchwork" Masses are undesirable, unconvincing, and disconnected, and as much so as if the celebrant wore a white chasuble, the deacon a red dalmatic, and the subdeacon a green tunic.

As to psalmody, which is the foundation, the germ, the seed of all Church music, this alone would easily furnish ample material for a complete article. The oft-repetition of the tunes upon the soul produces an indescribable emotion which seems to have been anticipated by Plato when he said, "The movement of sound so as to reach the soul for the education of it in virtue, we know not how, we call Music." These simple "movements of sound," these simple undulations, inflections, call them what you will, "never pall upon the ear and have a perennial freshness which no modern melodies possess." And here again let there be a perfect equality of syllable and a slight holding back at the mediation and ending. The pause at the colon should be long enough to enable everyone to take a full breath, and should be a conspicuous feature of psalmody. Even as late as Cardinal Wolsey's time he, in his visitation questions, asked if the "sober and reverend pause be made in the middle of each verse." At the end of the verse there should be no pause, as the antiphonal method of chanting does not demand it. A choir that has not known the beauties of psalmody can rarely ever appreciate those of the Gregorian Chant of later ages, whilst, as before insinuated, the choir that has not known the joy of singing the Chant can never fully appreciate the entrancing beauties of Palestrina.

A repertoire, therefore, of a dozen Masses, exclusive of the Chant, is all that is required for the average church, and if these be well chosen and perfectly prepared, there need be no feverish haste on all the great feasts to produce a new work. Never blend the different styles at the same service and, as far as possible keep to the same "schools," for such changes in Divine worship are as aggravating as those of modern costume. A choir that begins this "church music reform," as it has wrongly been styled, for it is merely a work of "restoration," with the permissible forms of music rarely succeeds. It is beginning at the wrong end. Let the rule be first observed, and then the exception, and the rule is the Chant.

As to Benediction the regulations of the various dioceses differ. In this we are first of all bound to sing a salutation, not necessarily the "O Salutaris," to the Blessed Sacrament. A motet in the vernacular or Latin must follow, and then the

"*Tantum Ergo*." The traditional melody to the "*Pange Lingua*" is greatly to be urged so that, when there is a procession of the Blessed Sacrament the entire congregation may take part and the procession need never again pass "through the long-drawn aisle and fretted vault" in the presence of a silent people.

The personnel of the choir is a matter to be regulated by the pastor and choirmaster. Women are no more permitted in the choir than they are in the sanctuary, but in congregational singing they are of the greatest use. The spiritual and official obligations must be clearly defined ere the enrolment begins. Their first duty is to lead the praises of God in which the people should take part. From the simple "Amen" to the "*Missa Papae Marcelli*" the same interest should be manifest in all. The constant training of boys is regarded by some as a nuisance, but it must be borne in mind that such a continuous method is bound to have most excellent results for their future. It is reported that in one parish alone this has resulted in five vocations to the priesthood, whilst similar results are being met with elsewhere. The usual objection to the unsuitableness of the boy-voice is probably due to a faulty method of training. Even the great Handel was content to employ boys exclusively in all his oratorio choruses. Twelve to fifteen boys, four altos, five tenors and six basses, may be considered as a fair balance for an ordinary choir. We are aware that there was a time when the Papal Choir consisted of six voices of each part, but it would be difficult to find such perfectly balanced voices nowadays. This, however, must be decided by the choir-master. The church choir must be a living parochial organization and be generally available. A paid quartet is a luxury.

An eminent organist once remarked that the church organs were now being built on such a large scale that it would soon be necessary to build churches to accommodate them. The rich diapason tone of olden times is rarely to be met with, whilst the up-to-date organ rather resembles a young orchestra. "The music proper to the Church is purely vocal." "As the vocal part ought always to predominate, the organ should merely support it, and never overpower it." An organ of medium size is all that is necessary. The organist must "preserve all the qualities of true sacred music enumerated above." A prelude of a devotional and anticipatory nature before the service is considered to be in good taste, whilst a postlude is equally effective. Some, however, maintain that the entrance of the celebrant and assistants commences the service and their exit ends it, and decline to provide musical accompaniment to the hurried footsteps of the retreating congregation. But these are matters to be decided by the organist himself. It would seem that wedding and other marches taken from operas are positively forbidden because they are "reminiscent of the theater," but there are many charming "voluntaries" equally appropriate for such times of rejoicing. Funeral marches before or after funerals are forbidden, whilst the use of the organ at these functions is only tolerated as a support to those choirs who are unable to sustain the pitch alone, and should cease when the voices cease. The same rule applies to Lent and Advent, excepting on Gaudete and Laetare Sundays at Mass only. Might one be allowed to urge the closing of the organs during these times? There is no finer "tonic" for a choir than to sing the whole of Advent and Lent without the organ, and the consequent improvement at Christmas and Easter is most marked.

The last ideal set before us is for each diocese to have its own *Schola Cantorum* and now that Rome has set the example in this direction we may expect to see this country imitate it at no distant date. The cost of such an institution is far less than one would suppose, and one has merely to examine the balance-sheet of the Pontifical Institute in Rome to learn of the probable cost, allowing, of course, for the difference in cost of living between America and Italy.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters, as a rule, should be limited to six-hundred words.

The Pope's Allocution

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I find this delightful cable from Rome in a New York newspaper of recent date: "The Pope delivered an allocution dealing mainly with religious matters."

How extraordinary!

Did he say nothing about bimetallism?

New York.

HENRY HOWARD GALE.

Perennial Youth

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Talking of the perennial youth of the classics, what could be more up to date than old Horace's:

*Qui didicit patriae quid debeat et quid amicis,
Quo sit amore parens, quo frater amandus et hospes,
Quod sit conscripti, quod iudicis officium, quae
Partes in bellum missi ducis, ille profecto
Reddere personae scit convenientia cuique!*

These lines from the "Ars Poetica" do not apply strictly, of course, to the present crisis, but the pagan poet would smile at their accidental pertinency.

Washington, D. C.

EDWIN J. ANWEILER, O.F.M.

"No Priests in the Trenches!"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I read with keen interest the communication headed "No Priests in the Trenches!" in your issue of June 30. Now is the time to follow up the suggestion with action. If the letter were printed as a circular to be signed with the sender's name, the Catholics of America could flood Washington with protests that would have their effect.

New Haven, Conn.

S. C. D.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

If his satanic majesty reads AMERICA he must have smiled rather grimly a few weeks ago when the appeal was printed about the priests in the trenches. *Cui bono!* He must have known that such appeals are always in vain. A few correspondents will send in a communication on the subject, possibly at a few meetings of Catholics the colloquial "Say" may introduce the topic, and the whole matter will be closed. *Cui bono* indeed! Who ever heard of Catholics in this country, or, for that matter, in any country, uniting in an effective protest? A caricature of a certain Congressman is passed through the mails, a protest follows, and the caricature is barred from the mails. Pope and priest, and anything Catholic, are ceaselessly, shamelessly, reviled and slandered, yet the mail remains accessible for this purpose. A few Jews are discriminated against in Russia, and forthwith we refuse to renew a treaty with that country till justice is done to the sons of Israel. Priests and religious are unjustly banished from France and Mexico, two republics, by the way, and our country is seeing blind. A Protestant nurse is endangered somewhere in Asia, and our man-of-war with \$250,000 in its hold, hastens to the rescue. Hundreds of Catholics and many priests and religious are ruthlessly murdered, or suffer a worse fate than death, in Armenia and Mexico; and we placidly cry out: "All's well with the world!" *Cui bono* indeed!

Mere man needs an outlet for his feelings, at times, and his poor wife, or his children, or, in their absence, a servant becomes the victim. Society is much like mere man; it too needs someone to serve as a scapegoat. And who ever heard of a more ideal scapegoat than the Catholic body? The country is on the verge of bankruptcy. What of it? Expel the Catholic priests and religious, confiscate their property, and the coffers of the State are replenished. When everything has been stolen, let them come back, so as to make a repetition possible. A

politician sees his political star waning. Why fret? He raises the battle-cry against the blood-sated Dragon of the Seven Hills; and, lo and behold, his battalions reassemble, and again his star has become one of the first magnitude. Unpleasant rumors have disturbed the City Hall or the State Capitol. Why worry? The next issue of the daily press horrifies the public with harrowing tales about Catholic charities; laws are immediately passed for the thorough inspection of such dangerous places as the dwellings of peaceful Sisters and the homes of the Good Shepherd; and public attention is diverted from real evils. That it has happened again and again makes no difference. The world wants to be humbugged and bedeviled, let it have its fill. Can we be blamed when, on reading such a sanguine appeal as that about the priests in the trenches, we shrug our shoulders and say: *Cui bono?* Ah, yes, if the Grand Knight of the K.C.'s, and the High Chief Ranger of the Foresters, and the supreme rulers of the other Catholic fraternities were to send an executive order to their various jurisdictions, prescribing that protests be sent by all the voters belonging to the courts or councils to the central Government at Washington... but is this even intrinsically possible?

Baltimore.

B. L.

Catholic Workmen and the Holy See

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The Federation of Catholic Workmen in Holland have sent the following address to the Holy Father:

The Federation of Catholic Workmen in the Netherlands, counting 50,000 members, pressed by the miseries of the cruel war that has broken out in Europe, kneel down at the feet of your Holiness to express their sincere gratitude for the efforts which your Holiness has made from the first day of your Pontificate to restore peace among the nations, to alleviate the sufferings of the wounded and captives, to relieve the heavy burden of the people living in districts occupied by hostile armies, and especially of the laboring classes who suffer more than others from the dreadful calamities of this bloody conflict.

In these sad and deplorable times we address your Holiness, convinced that the welfare of the nations rests in the hands of the common Father of Christendom, convinced also that the Catholic laborers, who thankfully remember the benefits which they owe to the teachings of the Holy See in matters relating to the labor question, have placed their hopes in their common Father that permanent peace, so long desired, may speedily return to the world.

Holy Father, we promise that the Catholic workmen of the Netherlands will not cease to pray that our dear Lord may bless the efforts of your Holiness in restoring peace among the nations and we appeal to the Catholic workmen of all countries to place their confidence in the intervention of the Holy See and to use all their influence with the Governments of their countries for the restoration of peace.

The example of the Catholic workmen of Holland ought to be imitated by all Catholic societies throughout the world.

West De Pere, Wis.

G. RYBROOK, Ord Praem.

The Red Cross and the Sister's Garb

To the Editor of AMERICA:

My letter of June 2, which you printed, seems to require further explanation. The Catholic Women's Association which was organized "to work for the country in its hour of need" belongs as a body to the National League for Woman's Service. In a circular of the League there is the following declaration: "The National League for Woman's Service is working in close cooperation with the Red Cross, and all registrations for medical, nursing and hospital supply work are referred immediately to that organization."

Acting according to this regulation, I wrote to Mr. Taft early in May, asking if 870 Sisters of Charity and 117 Sisters of Mercy, members of the Catholic Association and of the League would be permitted to become "enrolled" as Red Cross Nurses,

Mr. Taft referred my letter to Mr. Eliot Wadsworth who replied by sending me two circulars of the Red Cross, A. R. C. 161, entitled "Instructions for Nurses Called upon for Service in Military Hospitals," and A. R. C. 159, April, 1917, called "Nursing Service."

The first paragraph of 161 reads: "Red Cross nurses will be selected for temporary service in military hospitals either directly from Red Cross Headquarters through Base Hospital Units for Army and Navy Detachments, or by local Committees on Red Cross Nursing Service. If not enrolled they must in all cases become enrolled." Then follows a description of the distinctive uniform which every "enrolled" Red Cross nurse must wear. Of course this regulation excludes Sisters from serving as "enrolled Red Cross Nurses." That was my question, and the answer.

In order to make sure that my interpretation was correct, I consulted Mr. George Hoadly in regard to the two Red Cross circulars A. R. C. No. 161 and A. R. C. 159, *the only ones sent to me by the Red Cross authorities, or quoted by them in their assertion that the Red Cross admits members of the Catholic Sisterhoods as nurses in military hospitals.* Mr. Hoadly's professional opinion is as follows:

Harmon, Colston, Goldsmith & Hoadly
Attorneys at Law
St. Paul Building
Cincinnati, Ohio, July 3, 1917.

Mrs. Bellamy Storer,
2412 Upland Place,
Cincinnati, O.

My Dear Mrs. Storer:

Replying to yours of July 2, my opinion given you was, of course, based upon the documents which you submitted to me, which I assume are all that are in existence relating to the subject. You are entirely at liberty to use my opinion in the manner desired. I return you the enclosures and I see nothing in them to change the opinion already expressed to you and which I may here repeat. There is nothing in any of the circulars or papers which have been submitted to me which in any way contemplates the undertaking of nursing by any Sisterhood or Order as an organization, nor is there anything which in any way contemplates that the members of any such Order or Sisterhood, when engaged in nursing for, or under the auspices of the Red Cross, would be permitted, whether so engaged as an Order, or as individuals, to wear the garb or habit of the Order of which they are members. I do not say that such a provision does not exist. It certainly cannot be found in any of the papers you have submitted to me.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE HOADLY.

Let us hope that these regulations may be changed.
Cincinnati. MRS. BELLAMY STORER,
President of the Catholic Women's Association.

Retreats for Laymen

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In AMERICA for June 9 there appeared an interesting article on laymen's retreats. While it was quite enlightening and encouraging to one interested in the spread of this great movement, not a few New Englanders were disappointed to find no mention of the great retreat house of the Passionists at Brighton, Mass. The spot is ideal. Located within four miles of the center of Boston, the Monastery of Blessed Gabriel is situated on a great eminence which affords a commanding view of the city and adjoining territory for many miles. Gazing down from that spot, one feels in very truth lifted up above the things of earth: he is alone, in silent communion with God.

During the last six years an ever-increasing number of men have retired within these hallowed precincts to imbibe new strength from the fountain of grace. In this time, the retreat movement has gained great headway in Boston and its vicinity. In 1916 thirty-six retreats were given at Blessed Gabriel's, and

for 1917 thirty-nine have been listed. A unique feature of these retreats is found in the variety of organizations represented. Retreats are arranged for any group that desires to attend. Thus there are retreats for lawyers, doctors, teachers, post-office employees, telephone workers, the Catholic Union, Knights of Columbus councils, etc. A novelty this year is to be a retreat conducted solely for converts.

The benefits obtained from these retreats are so manifold that past retreatants have banded themselves into a strong organization known as the Promoters' Guild for Laymen's Retreats. This body is composed of about 1,500 men, each of whom pledges himself to make a retreat at least once a year. The number of promoters constantly returning and, by their enthusiasm, bringing their friends, swells the volume steadily. If the number of retreatants continues to increase, there will be need before long of a new retreat house separate from the monastery. A past governor, our present mayor and prominent judges and business men have been numbered among the throngs of laymen who have spent a week-end at this blessed spot.

Boston.

EDWARD W. JOYCE.

"Let Them Get Acquainted"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

More than one sympathetic comment will doubtless be called out by A. R.'s communication in your issue of June 30, even when a different point of view is expressed from that of your correspondent. My purpose is, however, only to voice surprise that in this day and generation there should remain any father—or mother, either—who retains control over a son or daughter twenty-eight years of age. I remember with "old country" folk a man of fifty was yet considered a "boy" from whom obedience was exacted, but nowadays, within the scope of my own knowledge and observation, any real parental authority is the exception, not the rule. There are scores of Catholic parents who instead of being the heads of homes and families are nothing more to their children than lodging-house keepers and purveyors of table-board. I do not mean to complicate an already complex problem, but I wonder whether mixed marriages and their attendant evils are not due to relaxed rather than over-rigid parental authority.

Brooklyn.

C. M. B.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The letter of M. E. in AMERICA of June 23 offers an interesting defense of the other side of the subject, "Let Them Get Acquainted." But the letter destroys its purpose, and goes beyond its implicit premises. Its argument baldly put is: Catholic Colleges with strict prohibition of all social intercourse between the sexes are a prolific source of vocations to the priesthood; and ninety-eight per cent of mothers of boys in our Catholic schools ardently wish in their hearts that a boy of theirs, nurtured amid such safeguards, may eventually become a priest. What will become of all those vocations if social activities are allowed ever so little to encroach upon the old traditional methods that have been so long in vogue in our Catholic colleges here in America? Of course, M. E. will loudly protest against such an interpretation of his letter. But a cursory reading of it with a modicum of intelligence leaves that impression, despite the author's protest that he does not wish to argue the "pros" and "cons" of the case. Why did he write the letter at all if he does not wish to put one side of the case?

M. E. says that the letter-writers "seem to think that the mixed-marriage problem is the greatest question in the world." Well, it would be hard to say what is the greatest question in the world, but certainly a question that touches the preservation of the Catholic home is pretty near the greatest question for the Catholic Church. There is probably nothing that generates infidelity more surely than mixed marriages. Statistics prove that

a greater per cent of the offspring of mixed marriages give up the practice of religion than of Protestant unions; and this although Protestantism is becoming increasingly weak in its convictions. M. E. goes on to say that his opponents "seem to think that college authorities can settle it by putting dances and five o'clock teas in the curriculum." Facetiousness is never argument, although it often passes as such with the unthinking. No sane person but would approve M. E.'s position as put by him. But do his opponents think as he says they do? One or two seem to, I admit; but the others would indignantly repudiate the insinuation, and would wonder what system of logic M. E. has learned. They do not believe, any more than Frank H. Spearman and the editor of AMERICA, that all mixed marriages will be eliminated from the world by acquaintances among Catholics.

Another statement of M. E.'s is altogether beside the mark. He says: "Let us ask them to consider that the widespread evil of mixed marriage does not find its chief or most numerous offenders among college men and women. These are, I say it confidently, though not with statistics at hand, only as two to ninety-eight." True; but what has that to do with the discussion? The question is not what percentage of all Catholics enter mixed marriages, but what percentage of college men and women do so. The percentage among them is, to put it conservatively, large enough to make us desire that some means be taken to reduce the number. Is it not a strange comment on Catholic education that young men and women who are supposed to have obtained the benefits of advanced Catholic training should, nevertheless, be such frequent offenders in a practice so unreservedly denounced by the Church? Here is a fact, argue about abstract theories as you will. That fact should be faced in the light of actual conditions in this country. Will M. E. deny that opportunities for our young men and women in colleges and academies to get acquainted, provided they are duly regulated by the schools, are likely to help meet the evil? For instance, suppose the example of Boston College, cited by M. E., were more universally followed?

M. E. again says, and this is the backbone of his plea, ". . . there are ninety-eight (mothers, in opposition to two of the others who plead for more opportunities for social acquaintance) just as zealous, in their hope that a ward or child of theirs may hearken to the Voice," calling to the priesthood. "And blessed are the home and the college which fosters opportunities for hearkening to the call of that Voice." Yet in the preceding paragraph he cites the example of Boston College, "whose school of arts, together with its high school, numbers nearly 2,000 students, alert in all the excellences of academic performances, and in the forefront of athletics, continually (*italics inserted*) showing a round of social hours, brilliant and distinguished in every way. Yet Boston College, thank God, sends more candidates, in proportion to its size, to the Church, including both the secular and the religious priesthood, than any other college in the country, omitting, of course, the little seminaries." Perhaps M. E. can explain by what system of logic he can oppose "ample opportunities for getting acquainted" on the score of fostering vocations to the priesthood, and yet cite Boston College in a way that proves it is not hampered in attaining the very object that M. E. has rightly at heart.

But it is the supposition underlying his plea which will not stand exposure. That supposition is that Catholic colleges have as one of their primary ends to foster recruiting for the priesthood. M. E. will deny that such is his supposition. But will a logical mind that peruses his letter listen to any such protest? Now Catholic colleges are not instituted to foster recruiting to the priesthood, but to train men and women for the responsibilities of Catholic life. St. Ignatius Loyola, who first organized Catholic education under the direction of a Religious Order, was led to do so from the desire to train the Catholic mind from

boyhood, so as to insure a sturdy Catholic laity. The idea of thus providing "recruiting stations" for the priesthood does not seem to have entered his mind. The matter of increasing the ranks of the priesthood is a work of Divine Providence, and will be safe so long as the words "I will be with you until the consummation of the world" will hold good. Long before colleges were established "which foster opportunities for hearkening to the call of that Voice," there were numerous priests to carry on the work of the Divine Master.

The best way to foster vocations to the priesthood is to promote genuine Catholic homes filled with Catholic atmosphere, and anything that tends to eliminate mixed marriages will promote the existence of such homes. Moreover, there are Catholic colleges in the country that have adhered far more closely to the old traditions, and in which one would have imagined that in them, if anywhere, "opportunities were fostered for hearkening to that Voice" of vocation, still the vocations from such colleges are in a remarkable small number. Again, it is a noteworthy fact that day-schools generally give more recruits to the Catholic priesthood than boarding-schools. But who will deny that day-scholars have far more opportunities for social activities than those in boarding-schools, where "opportunities for hearkening to that Voice" are so sedulously guarded? I dare say that even M. E.'s favorite Boston College, with all its "continual round of social hours," gives more to the priesthood than formerly, when it did not permit such "innovations."

It seems to me that all this goes to show that the efficient means of fostering vocations to the priesthood are genuine Catholic families in which the spirit of the Church holds sway. As for the statement that ninety-eight per cent of good mothers who silently hope that "a ward or child of theirs may hearken to the Voice . . . in a college which fosters opportunities for hearkening to its call," I dare say that ninety-eight per cent of Irish mothers, who still retain Ireland's old spirit, have such a noble hope; but I doubt that the same can be said for ninety-eight per cent of all the mothers of the country, to their shame be it said. I know that in certain parts of the country far removed from the good Catholic Irish of Boston, the inverse ratio is rather the truer average. I admit that this is due to a weak spirit of Catholicism; but it is just such a weak spirit of Catholicism that Frank H. Spearman hopes to improve in his plea for more ample opportunities for good Catholic young men and women in our colleges and academies to get acquainted. In a word, if colleges and academies do their part in facilitating unions between thoroughly trained Catholic youths and maidens, the Catholic priesthood will have ample recruits. Catholic Ireland is the most prolific of all the countries in vocations to the priesthood, despite the ample opportunities its young people have and have always had to get acquainted. "Getting acquainted" amid Catholic influences does not prevent vocations, but it does promote good Catholic unions. I am as anxious as M. E. to see vocations fostered; but I am also anxious to see something done that will remove the reproach which I have often heard made, "N. married a Protestant, although he (or she) was educated and even graduated from the Catholic college or academy."

The question arises, "Who is to settle just what opportunities for getting acquainted should be granted our young people while at school?" Certainly not individual parents, who have nothing but a few years of experience of their own to draw upon, an experience, moreover, which is often biased by ideas which they have unconsciously picked up in an un-Catholic atmosphere. It is the directors of our Catholic schools themselves, and notably the clergy in our Catholic colleges, who have had experience in dealing with souls, who have to decide the question. It would be interesting to have the faculty of Boston College, which has been so successful with "its continual round of social hours," give to Catholic America its ideas on this subject.

St. Louis.

E. B. G.

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, JULY 21, 1917

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.

President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 59 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW.

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Contributions to the Mission Literature Fund may be sent direct to AMERICA.

"Catholic Disaffection"

IN the goodly town of Ipswich in the State of Massachusetts, dwells a writer of letters to New York newspapers, one Mr. Erving Winslow. Twelve inches or so beneath a head somewhat befuddled by provincialism, a timorous heart beats wildly in the erstwhile placid Winslow bosom. "Trouble is ahead!" gasps the Sage of Ipswich, trouble aroused by mobs and draft riots.

Alas! today among those who have the ear of Irish-Americans are many, including one great prelate of the Roman Catholic Church at least, who are responsible by their indiscreet speech for disaffection among its members.

Now not far from the goodly town of Ipswich lies the goodlier town of Boston, which by reason of Puritanic contempt of the natural law, is largely populated by Catholics. Even though habitually lulled into somnolence by large draughts of the justly celebrated soothing-syrup which bears, by accident, his name, it is just possible that in occasional waking moments, Mr. Winslow has heard of Cardinal O'Connell, the Archbishop of Boston. But such utterances of the Cardinal as these, he seems to have missed, or, possibly, he considers them "indiscreet":

The one thing now that is necessary, and the only thing that will stand firmly through all the varying vicissitudes before us, will be this principle: *Our country is now at war, and we are bound before God to render it our fullest assistance.*

And is Ipswich, Massachusetts, so barred from communication from the outer world, that no news has come to it of the great letter of the American Archbishops to the President of the United States, or of the inspiring pastorals of his Eminence, Cardinal Farley, the Archbishop of New York? St. Paul is a western see, in the heart of a land of darkness, and doubtless is not recognized by this Massachusetts Brahmin. Nevertheless, the rest of the country has applauded the patriotic deeds and speeches of that soldier of the Civil War, the Most Rev. John Ireland, Archbishop of St. Paul. Baltimore

is nearer home. Does Mr. Winslow batten in ignorance of the many speeches, letters and pastorals of a prelate whom the whole country delights to honor, his Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons? And, if it be permitted once more to turn our indiscreet and disaffected faces towards the West, is Mr. Erving Winslow so deeply buried in the solitudes of Ipswich, Massachusetts, that he has heard nothing at all of the letters of the Archbishops of Chicago, Cincinnati, and San Francisco?

"Disaffection among its members!" The sum of Mr. Winslow's ignorance grows apace and grows appalling. Holy Cross College is not on the other side of the moon, nor is that "little bit of Oxford," Boston College. When war came, hundreds of young students, Americans everyone of them, tarried not to write to the newspapers, but left the classrooms of Boston and Holy Cross, to serve their country. Their action was not singular; they had imbibed patriotism with their Catholic mothers' milk. Has Mr. Winslow heard nothing of the boys now in the field, once students of Georgetown, child of that Revolutionary patriot, Archbishop Carroll; of the Catholic University, of Fordham, Manhattan, Notre Dame, Loyola, Detroit, Marquette, St. Louis, New Orleans, St. Thomas, St. John's, Gonzaga, Creighton, Santa Clara, and a score of other Catholic colleges, beacons of liberty, burning from New England to the Pacific, from the Gulf of Mexico to the Canadian line? Does he know nothing at all of regiments in his own State, in New York, in Illinois, composed almost entirely of Catholics? Has he not heard that although Catholics form a bare one-seventh of the country's population, the War Department has ruled that, in order to minister to hundreds of thousands of Catholic soldiers, at least one-third of the army chaplains must be Catholic priests?

"Disaffection among its members!" If this be disaffection, may God fan the flame into a consuming conflagration, for in such disaffection alone is the safety of our beloved country to be sought.

An Agnostic Over Night

A LADY in the West became an agnostic over night and wrote to tell AMERICA all about it. Her reasons implied and stated are clear: She is an Austrian by blood, and the Church does not prevent wars.

In this instance, blood, no doubt, gave rise to emotions that swept the lady into sadness and perhaps into gentle despair. But why into agnosticism? Did it prevent the war? Lo, the battle is on, and men perish by the thousands.

Let that problem pass, it pales before the second reason set down in the letter. But does it? Is the second motive stronger than the first? Hardly. It is founded on a false supposition. The Church has no warrant to prevent war. On the contrary there are circumstances under which she would be bound by virtue of her office as teacher and defender of truth, to put the stamp of approval upon arms.

But this war is unjust! In the premises the objection is irrelevant. It leads away from the general principle that the Church must prevent war. War is not this war, there have been and will be other wars, quite distinct from this war. But granted that this war is unjust. Where does the injustice lie? With the Central Powers? What part has their leader, Lutheran Prussia, with the Catholic Church? Does the injustice rest with the Allies? How long is it since their chief, England, or their great purveyor of men, Russia, or even France, broke with Rome? It were better grace, but poor logic still, to hurl anathemas at Lutheranism, Anglicanism, the Orthodox Church or agnosticism than to renounce Catholicism.

The Church does not prevent war, hence a lady of Austrian blood became an agnostic.

Years ago the Son of Man warned and rewarned Jerusalem that if it did not hearken to His Word, the enemy would come upon the city and ravage it: the enemy came, and the destruction and carnage were great beyond measure. Where the blame? With Christ? With His Word? No, with perfidious Jerusalem only.

But then the lady did not become an agnostic because the Church does not prevent wars, nor yet because the Church did not prevent this war. The cause of her lapse is within her soul. May she find it!

Justice for Anarchists

LONG a menace to any community afflicted by their sordid presence, Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman will no more disturb the peace and dignity of New York. A free and unrestricted trial made somewhat notable by the defendants' brazen insolence towards a long-suffering court and their studied contempt for American institutions, has ended with the imposition of the law's maximum penalty, a fine of \$10,000, two years' imprisonment, and the prospect of deportation at the expiration of sentence. Loudly proclaiming that they asked for nothing but justice, they have obtained what they sought.

It need hardly be said that no constitutional guarantee was on trial in this celebrated case. The clear issue was the lawfulness of conspiracy to obstruct the law, and in no sense was rightful "free speech" involved. Yet for many years it has been plain to impartial observers, that in this country the easy limits of free speech have been stretched to a degree which sooner or later would provoke, and apparently justify, attacks on the very foundations of all government. On the screen and the stage, in the press and from the forum, in professors' chairs and on street corners we have tolerated under the alleged sanction of "free speech," open incitements to the violation of law, both human and Divine. With war at our gates, and with Federal convictions secured against notorious exploiters of anarchy, who have long found lawlessness an easy way of making a living, it is

hoped that our too lax public opinion will swing back into the zone of sanity.

Under our form of government ample constitutional provision for the repeal of laws distasteful to the majority is at hand. Any citizen is free to advocate by petition and in peaceful gatherings the repeal of measures which in his judgment are inimical to the best interests of the community. This freedom to assemble and petition the Government for the redress of wrongs, is essential to the maintenance of our republican institutions, and evil the day which abrogates it. But no advocacy may lawfully include treason or sedition. As Judge Mayer well said in his charge to the jury:

This is a republic founded on the principle of obedience to law. It can remain a republic only as long as the law is obeyed. For people who would destroy this Government by nullifying its laws, we have no place.

As a corollary, it may be added that with the departure of Goldman, Berkman, and others, convicted last month, the birth-control movement has lost some of its most ardent advocates. Treason to God and nature frequently works out in treason to country.

Entertaining the Congregation

THERE could scarcely be a more striking indication of the bankruptcy of popular Protestantism than the fact that a book called "Church Advertising, Why and How," has recently been published to meet what is presumably a "crying need." The twenty-one papers in the volume were read before the "Church Advertising Section of the Twelfth Annual Convention of the World's Associated Advertising Clubs," and a number of the speakers were ministers with D.D. after their names. Though one of those who addressed the gathering cautioned his hearers against giving "the impression that it is necessary to force members to go to church," and against making "people think that you must beg outsiders to come," most of the speakers insisted on the importance of systematic and aggressive advertising if the church's pews are to be kept filled. The preacher, moreover, must "deliver the goods," he advertises. "A crowd lured by a startling topic will expect to be stirred by the sermon, and will regard itself as 'buncoed' if it doesn't feel thrills." So the conscientious will of course take care to meet their hearers' expectations.

A Methodist minister of New York who, most fittingly, is "President of the Church Advertising and Publicity Departmental," then told his less practical and rather old-fashioned confreres just how to "put it over." One "Sunday night attraction" he used, for instance, was a lecture on the development of airships, "while the pastor followed with a message on 'Faith's Wings.'" Next Sunday there was a "remarkable motion-picture of a romance built round a submarine," and as the U-boat came to the surface the thoroughly up-to-date pastor preached on "Submarine Sins." On the first Sunday of July he would hold a "Snow Service"

with "movies" of the Arctic regions, and he took care that a "pile of snow, together with a block of ice" in which fruit and flowers were frozen, "were placed on the table before the pulpit." On a subsequent Sunday every worshiper received a duly advertised rosy apple. Here are some other methods by which this highly modern preacher made piety attractive to his congregation:

Last spring Secretary Josephus Daniels came over from Washington and answered critics concerning the navy. Judge Ben Lindsey was highly popular to a great company as he related Juvenile Court incidents. Other speakers, such as the late Mayor Gaynor, Mayor Mitchel and various city commissioners, have also been invited in. Hans Kronold, the most noted 'cellist, and W. D. Hinshaw, a grand-opera basso, were other features. When the "Giants" were on the verge of capturing the pennant, a baseball service was arranged. Statements concerning their indebtedness to religion were secured from Herzog, Snodgrass, Fletcher, Chief Meyers, and other conspicuous players.

"Apt subjects will draw listeners," was one of the speaker's concluding remarks. No doubt. But it would be interesting to know how many of his listeners and spectators were worshipers. Matters have come to a sad pass when Christians can be lured to church only by a flamboyant advertisement that promises they will be amused and entertained there. If the object of preaching is to turn sinners into penitents, the "popular" services conducted by that New York minister must be somewhat unsatisfactory.

Praise and a Warning

ONE in whom the fine old phrase and finer reality, "gentleman and scholar," is amply verified, Mr. Ralph Adams Cram, has recently startled New England by advocating State aid for private secondary schools. Mr. Cram has in mind, particularly, the parochial schools of the Catholic Church; but he would not exclude any worthy educational institute. Their results, he recognizes, are of immense value to society; yet, under the present system, they must do this work, which the State confessedly cannot accomplish, under the grievous burden of a double tax. It is as if the State were to say, "I know that you are training boys and girls to be good fathers and mothers, assets to your communities, and that you are training them in a manner which I cannot parallel. Therefore will I make your work very difficult, and in some places, quite impossible. You must pay dearly for the privilege of aiding me." Mr. Cram has not weighed the product of the private schools in the balance of sentiment, but of fact.

As a professor in a technical institution where I come in contact with upwards of 200 young men in my own department, in the course of a year, I can say that the products of the private schools, and specifically of the Roman Catholic parochial schools and colleges, compare at least favorably with their fellows of a different educational experience. This is true of character, as well as I can judge it in three years of personal acquaintance. When it comes to a question of clear constructive thinking and clean-cut incisive expression, the products of the parochial schools generally stand first.

Gratifying as is this recognition of the work of our schools, upon which some pseudo-Catholics who send their children to non-Catholic institutions look with ill-bred disdain, we shall do well to ponder upon this warning, spoken by a friendly critic:

I am not giving a blanket-vote of confidence to the private schools and the parochial schools, for all of them fail in certain directions, and many of them are vitiated by their effort to follow the popular lines in vogue in the public schools.

Happily, the Catholic schools which ape the extremes of secular educationists are exceedingly few, and are growing fewer. Some forms of foolishness resist counsel, and can be cured only by the sharp remedy of failure.

"Patriotism Not Enough"

PATRIOTISM is a virtue, loved of God and man; in these days there is small danger that we forget it. Our peril lies another way. We may forget that hatred is a deadly sin. "Standing as I do in view of God and of eternity," wrote that brave woman, Edith Cavell, "I realize that patriotism is not enough. I must have no hatred or bitterness towards anyone."

Our virtues may become vices by excess, if they are not founded on principles sanctioned by the Divine Model and Law-Giver, Jesus Christ. The Son of God hated the deeds of the sinner, as only Infinite Goodness can hate malevolence, but He did not hate the sinner. He would not call down fire from heaven, as His hasty Apostles wished. It was not His will that the sinner die, but that he be converted and live; and what He preached, He practised to the end. On Calvary, the first words framed by His parched lips were a prayer, that the ingrates who had brought Him to this shameful death, might find mercy with His Eternal Father. The legions of Heaven at His disposal, did not beat to the earth the recreant priests and gibing Pharisees, but suffered them to look with impunity, upon Him whom they had pierced. The sublimity of Calvary passes all understanding, transcends all imitation, yet it gives us the principle to be translated, as far as human frailty will bear us, into our lives. We must hate injustice and abhor iniquity; but we must also remember, that those who persecute us without cause are to be forgiven, even as we hope to be forgiven, to be loved, because He bade us love even our enemies.

Every Catholic knows the measure of his obligations as a patriot. His country may ask him to give his life, that she may live. He does not doubt, nor does his country, what his answer will be. The bones of his fathers, whitening on every battlefield of the Republic, guarantee his complete devotion. With confidence may we invoke the protection of our Father in Heaven over our beloved land, for our cause is just. Yet "patriotism is not enough." Without charity, we are nothing. Let us press forward in our great task without bitterness, without recrimination, with malice towards none, with charity for all.

Literature

LITERATURE AND TWADDLE

THE sketches of the late Jack London published a few months ago emphasize the fact that it was after reading an account of a storm in one of Mr. Joseph Conrad's books that the American novelist, then a very young man, "found himself" and wrote a similar description in a successful competition for a newspaper prize. He then proceeded to take up writing as a vocation and succeeded admirably at it, provided that ability to make money by writing and to attract many readers represents success. However that may be, the story tempts one to make a comparison between the published work of Mr. London as we have it and Mr. Conrad's, that is, if in Virgil's phrase it is allowed to compare small things with great. For Mr. Conrad is perhaps the one man writing fiction in our day whose work has a serious claim to be literature. There was surely never so much fiction written as in our time, and it would seem that in the very quantity of it there must be considerable sterling quality. But not only literary critics, but the very writers of present-day fiction are agreed that almost no one in our time is writing anything worth while. Not long since a number of the most prominent writers of best-selling novels in this country and in England were asked to name their six favorite novels. The number of votes for each were taken and averaged in order to determine what group of novels was the most popular among our novel writers. To the surprise perhaps of youthful enthusiastic readers of the popular story-writers of our day, the average age of the "favorite novel" of these authors of "best-sellers" was not 1916 nor even 1910 nor 1900, but almost a century ago, 1819. Not a single novel written in the twentieth century was mentioned at all. The only story of our generation that was on the list was one of George Meredith's written some thirty years ago. I may say, moreover, that when George Meredith's book appeared it was not a best-seller, and it may be suggested with all due deference to youthful enthusiasm that whenever a novel is a best-seller, it does not rank high as literature. The very fact that it appeals without delay to a very large number of people, demonstrates almost to a certainty that the book is concerned with such trivial, superficial, ephemeral interests that it can have no serious significance.

Mr. Conrad is one of the few men now doing really serious work in fiction and, needless to say, he does not write best-sellers. I doubt if any of his books has ever been on that list. They have too much to do with the minds of his characters and with the thoughts that dominate them, to be popular. For most things that are popular in our day are not thought-provoking but sense-satisfying. We do not go to the theater to see plays any more, but to see "shows," as we frankly call them. Nor do we go to see great pictures, for the attendance at the Metropolitan Museum is shameful in its scantiness and a disgrace to the community. The attendance at the "movie shows," however, where people go to see cheap trivial pictures which tell them superficial stories that may arouse the imagination but never provoke thought, is so large as to be an unending source of surprise even to the managers of film-halls. Great pictures provoke thought just as a Shakespearean play does. But we do not want to be made to think, we only want to see and hear and feel.

Mr. Jack London was more read than Mr. Conrad, because you do not have to think to read London's books. You need only let the words flow in and they show you a series of pictures and provoke a set of feelings, but do not disturb the mental faculties so deeply as to arouse thought. They stir the imagination, the fantasy, but not the understanding. It is very probable that this organ of fantasy is largely physical in its basis. It has almost none of the qualities of the higher powers of the

mind. It sees pictures, recalls pictures, even sometimes slightly modifies pictures, but never creates them, and hence it is a very easy faculty to use. Moreover people now think much more of their bodies than they do of their minds. They prefer very clean bodies to clean minds. Indeed they apparently waste very little time about the idea that the mind should be clean. They are much more intent on exercising their bodies, and getting into good condition than on exercising their minds. Reading of the Jack London order gives a certain amount of occupation to the senses and the fantasy, but Conrad's stories require thought and exercise of mind.

The incidents in the two sets of novels, those of Mr. London and Mr. Conrad revolve about the same sort of people situated in quite similar circumstances. The adventures are very much the same, but in Mr. London's novels the incidents are everything, while in Mr. Conrad's the characters are everything. In the one set of books the weaving of the plot is the most important quality of the stories. In the other set the development of the characters is the all important aim of the writer. The value of the books is just in proportion to the difference in value between these two interests. Human beings are infinitely more valuable than things, and are of inestimably more significance than the incidents which happen to them. Men mean much more than their environment. In direct ratio then to the value of their subjects is the value of the books. A quantity of talk about happenings is not much more than trifling. On the other hand the description of how human beings are affected by their surroundings is literature.

The distinction between Mr. London's work and that of Mr. Conrad is worth while emphasizing because it contains the gist of the whole problem of modern reading and what is called modern literature. The proper interest of mankind is man, not things. Things are ever prone to usurp the place, indeed they are always intruding themselves on men and sometimes bolstering up their claim for attention very speciously, but they do not represent anything like the same significance as human interests. One is reminded very much of a passage in one of Mr. Conrad's greatest books, "Nostromo," in which he shows how avarice may dominate a number of lives until it crushes the humanity out of them. One of the characters says to the new owner to whom the gold mine which is the center of the avarice in the book has been passed on: "There is no peace and no rest in the development of material interests. They have their law and their justice, but it is founded on expediency, and it is inhuman; it is without rectitude, without the continuity and the force that can be found only in a moral principle."

There are many people who ask what literature is. The answer to the question is perhaps contained in those sentences from Conrad. Literature concerns life, human life in its moral aspects, because that is the only thing worth calling human. Other things may get into literature, but only in as much as they touch life and influence its moral side in some way do they really belong there.

After they have read a book people want to know if it is literature. Well, the criterion for the answer to that question is: Have you been interested in what happened in the book or in the people to whom it happened? Has the deepest part of your interest regarded the way the story's characters reacted to the incidents or to the succession of the incidents? Have the characters remained quite unchanged, though the incidents varied greatly, and were the people the same at the end as they were at the beginning? In that case you have been reading twaddle and not literature.

JAMES J. WALSH, M.D.

ATTAINMENT

Let me go back again. There is the road,
O memory! the humble garden lane
So young with me. Let me rebuild again
The start of faith and hope by that abode:
Amend with morning freshness all the code
Of youth's desire; remap the charted main
With tuneful joy, and plan a far campaign
For prouder marches in ambition's mode.

Ah, no, my heart! more certain now the skies
With joy abide. The cage of tree and sod,
Horizons firm that faith and hope attain,
Far realms of innocence in children's eyes,
And hearts harmonious with the will of God,—
These might I miss if I were back again.

MICHAEL EARLS, S.J.

REVIEWS

The Adventure of Death. By ROBERT W. MACKENNA, M.A., M.D. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$1.50.

This dainty volume of some 200 pages is a study of death, suggested indeed by the present dreadful conflict, but embodying the author's reflections of many years as physician and philosopher. In the opening chapters death, to rob it of its terrors, is represented as the great adventure of life, and there are agreeable anecdotes of those who met death fearlessly. The author's experience as a physician is then requisitioned to prove that whatever may be the preliminary state of the moribund, the actual moment of death is almost universally free from pain and terror, religion being the chief castor-out of fear.

It is refreshing to find the book so outspoken in its condemnation of euthanasia, which, so it says, springs from selfishness or cowardice, and is open to all manner of abuse. "Medicine is and ought to be the art of healing, not of dealing death." But it is the last three chapters of the book that will have the strongest appeal. "What life gains from death" opens up delightful vistas of thought, e.g.: If no one died, the world would be over-peopled; there would be no room for new lives; consequently no children; and a world without children would be a black inferno. Immortality then furnishes the theme for the finest portion of the book, for while from the point of view of logic or metaphysics it could be improved, from the literary and esthetic viewpoint it is excellent. The Catholic will miss the note of supernaturalism, to him of course so inseparable from such a topic as death. Though Dr. Mackenna does not strike this note, he is religious withal, having, though a scientist, a reverence, more than expressed, for the theologian. On the other hand, he has only scorn for the "pseudo-science of the barber's shop or the raucous orator of the street corner. . . the truly great scientific investigator is usually a man of reverent mind. A Paine or a Strindberg will deny where a Kelvin or a Lister will keep silence in reverent expectancy." Specimens of his method are:

Matter and energy are his [man's] servants . . . The servants are indestructible; shall the master be destroyed? Surely reason can make but one answer, which is that mind also is imperishable and must persist. . . The loftier a man's ideals, the less opportunity is there of seeing their attainment in this life. "The man with the muckrake" can get out of life all that he seeks after; the pure soul of a Sir Galahad, with ideas of absolute truth and absolute goodness, cannot attain its goal this side of the grave. If there is any justice in the scheme of things, as we know there is, surely the high ideal will not be penalized.

The book seems called forth by the appalling death-roll in Europe. May the war give it a welcome to American readers. In a land where belief in immortality is apparently waning, it will do good.

J. F. X. M.

Papers from Picardy. By T. W. PYM and G. GORDON. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co. \$1.50.

This is a thoughtful book by two Church of England army chaplains. It is made up of papers written during the summer and autumn of 1916, when the fighting was hot along the Somme. As men dedicated to the spiritual welfare of the soldiers the writers treat of topics that few war-books contain, for instance, the effect of war-conditions on morality and religion, the good and bad results of discipline, and the prospect of a new England after peace has come. Mr. Pym's reflections on self-discipline are good. He holds that it is the duty of the churchmen and clergy of England to build up in the English nation the quality of self-discipline which he finds sadly wanting at home, always, and at the front, when the men are not under orders. He well remarks:

Where we affect to take discipline into our own hands, we must be like the Roman Church much stricter and more consistent. The Church like the army is a system. We have therefore in the Church those very features that appeal to the soldier. But we cannot expect him to recognize the discipline of the Church unless its own officers respect that discipline more than in the past we have given any appearance of doing.

While many will not agree with the deductions drawn from the experience of these chaplains, nearly all the book's readers will take pleasure in the frank manner in which these men who have been at the front deal with the bad, as well as the good results, that trench-life and war-conditions bring about. The authors say that it is their unshakeable conviction "That Christ alone holds the key to the social and individual problems which the war is forcing on our notice."

G. C. T.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

The contents of the July 22 *Catholic Mind* are quite varied and interesting. The number opens with the address on "American Catholic History and Religion" which Father Richard H. Tierney delivered last March in New York at a meeting of the United States Catholic Historical Society. He urges that throughout the land tablets be set up to commemorate the early achievements of the Church in this country. Then follows the text of the protest that the American Archbishops made against the new anti-Catholic Constitution of Mexico. The secular press, it is said, could find no room for the document. The authoritative list of readings on "Luther and Lutheranism" which the "Catholic Encyclopedia" offers is also given and the number ends with Professor Max Drennan's observations on "The Dangers of 'Movies.'"

"Child's Life of Mary, Queen of Scots" and "Child's Life of Abraham Lincoln" (Catholic Book Co., Wheeling, W. Va., \$0.25 each) are illustrated volumes of a new "young folks series." They were written by Mary Marget MacEachen for little boys and girls who do not like long sentences. The author succeeds in filling her young readers with love and admiration for the characters she describes—"The Village Shield" (Dutton, \$1.50) by Ruth Gaines and Georgia Willis Read, is the latest addition to the "Little Schoolmate Series." It is a story of present-day life in Mexico with most of the political disturbances omitted. It is hard to believe that the idyllic conditions and gentle characters of this volume can exist along with the Mexico of which we have lately heard so much. Though the authors seem to be in sympathy with Padre Francisco and the work of the priests, their knowledge of a priest's duties and religion are somewhat vague and imperfect.

"What Luther Taught" (America Press, \$0.15 a copy, \$10.00 a hundred) is a clear and scholarly booklet containing seven

papers on the heresiarch's doctrine by Fathers Husslein and Reville, associate editors of AMERICA. Going for their material to the "reformers's" own writings and conversations, and to the works of Janssen, Denifle and Grisar, the authors give an irrefragable exposition of Luther's teachings under the captions: "Luther and Freedom of Thought," "Luther and the State," "Luther and Religion," "Luther and Social Life," "Luther and Education," "Luther, Slaves and Peasants" and "Luther and Woman." The pamphlet is also a brief and unanswerable refutation of the threadbare calumnies against the Church to which Luther and his followers have given currency. As the promoters of the Luther tercentenary celebration in this country, notwithstanding the fact that we are at war with Germany, still hope to convince the public that the heresiarch was a great benefactor of the human race, "What Luther Taught" will show how baseless is their claim.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Apostleship of Prayer, New York:**
Manual of the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Compiled from Authentic Sources. \$0.25.
- Benzinger Brothers, New York:**
Life of St. Ignatius of Loyola. By Father Genelli; Life of Made-moiselle le Gras (Louise de Marillac) Foundress of the Sisters of Charity; Women of Catholicity. By Anna T. Sadlier. \$0.50 each; The "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas. Part II. By Fathers of the English Dominican Province. \$2.75; Leaves of Gold. Compiled by Fiona McKay. \$0.50.
- The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Indianapolis:**
Someone and Somebody. By Porter Emerson Browne. Illustrated by Clarence F. Underwood. \$1.35.
- The Catholic Book Co., Wheeling:**
Child's Life of Abraham Lincoln; Child's Life of Mary Queen of Scots. By Mary Marget MacEachen. \$0.25 each.
- The Century Co., New York:**
Inside the British Isles, 1917. By Arthur Gleason. \$2.00.
- George H. Doran Co., New York:**
One Young Man. The Experiences of a Young Clerk Who Enlisted in 1914, Fought for Nearly Two Years, Was Severely Wounded, and Is Now on His Way Back to His Desk. Edited by J. E. Hodder Williams. \$0.75.
- E. P. Dutton Co., New York:**
Helen of Four Gates. By an Ex-Mill-Girl. \$1.50; Soldiers' Spoken French. By Helene Cross. \$0.60.
- B. Herder, St. Louis:**
Breviarium Romanum, ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini Restitutum, S. Pii V Pontificis Maximi Iussu Editum, Aliorumque Pontificum Cura Recognitum, Pii Papae X Auctoritate Reformatum. 4 vols. \$8.00.
- Alfred A. Knopf, New York:**
The Book of Camping. By A. Hyatt Verrill. Illustrated. \$1.00.
- John Lane Co., New York:**
The Red Planet. By William J. Locke. \$1.50.
- Longmans, Green & Co., New York:**
Letters of Arthur George Heath. With Memoir by Gilbert Murray. \$1.25; In War Time. Poems. By May Wedderburn Cannan. \$0.90; A Scallop Shell of Quiet. Introduced by Margaret L. Woods. \$0.60; Sermon Notes. By the Late Mgr. Robert Hugh Benson. Edited by the Rev. C. C. Martindale. \$1.25; The Upbringing of Daughters. By Catherine Durning Whetham. \$1.75; The House Fly. A Slayer of Men. By F. W. Fitzsimons, F. Z. S., F. R. M. S., etc. \$0.35.
- The Macmillan Company, New York:**
The Life of Algernon Charles Swinburne. By Edmund Gosse, C. B. \$3.50; The English-Speaking Peoples. Their Future Relations and Joint International Obligations. By George Louis Beer. \$1.50; Fairhope, the Annals of a Country Church. By Edgar Dewitt Jones. \$1.25; Experiments in Educational Psychology. By Daniel Starch, Ph.D. \$1.00; My Mother and I. By E. G. Stern. \$1.00; The Empty House. \$1.40.
- Oxford University Press, New York:**
Italy Mediaeval and Modern; a History. By E. M. Jamison, C. M. Ady, K. D. Vernon and C. Sanford Terry. \$2.90.
- The Poetry Review Co., Cambridge:**
George Edward Woodberry. A Study of His Poetry. By Louis V. Ledoux. \$1.00.
- The Polish Book Importing Co., New York:**
Political History of Poland. By Edward H. Lewinski-Corwin, Ph.D. \$3.00.
- G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York:**
Over the Top. By an American Soldier Who Went. Arthur Guy Empey. \$1.50; The Monks of Westminster. Being a Register of the Brethren of the Convent from the Time of the Confessor to the Dissolution. With Lists of the Obedientaries and an Introduction. By E. H. Pearce, M. A. \$3.00.
- G. Schirmer, New York:**
Vocal Art-Science. By Frank E. Miller, A. M., M. D. With a Foreword by Gustav Kobbe. \$2.50.
- Scott, Foresman & Co., New York:**
Our Country in Story. By The Franciscan Sisters of the Perpetual Adoration, St. Rose Convent, La Crosse, Wisconsin.
- The Torch Press, New York and Cedar Rapids, Iowa:**
The Sublime Sacrifice. A Drama of the Great War. By Charles V. H. Roberts. \$1.25.
- University Museum, Philadelphia:**
Sumerian Grammatical Texts. By Stephen Langdon; Lists of Akkadian Personal Names. By Edward Chiera; Sumerian Liturgical Texts. By Stephen Langdon.
- The University of Chicago Press, Chicago:**
Recreation and the Church. By Herbert Wright Gates. \$1.00.

EDUCATION

In the Village Smithy

NOT since he left his village, more than a generation since, had he looked upon a smithy, and he came upon it on East Sixty-Eighth Street in the City of New York. Surely time and nature had been kindly thus to leave it, darkened with the smoke of the forge, among the tenements of the Middle East Side, a reminiscence of a former, simpler day. But there it was, and through the gloom of its dim recesses, like stars flashing across a dark sky, the sparks flew from the anvil to the tune of cheery music from the sledge.

And the children coming home from school
Look in at the open door. . . .

But not in Manhattan. There the parallel is broken. Flocks of children were coming home from school, but not one stopped to listen to the roar of the bellows, to regale his ears with the grateful hiss of the iron in the cooling tub, to feast his eyes on "the large and sinewy hands" of the smith. For they were twentieth-century children, and city-bred children to boot, intent upon other interests. So they hurried by; some to engage in the marts of small trade by peddling newspapers, others to keep an engagement at the Municipal Playground, or perchance, at the locally popular moving-picture theater.

CHANGING INFLUENCES

A TEAR for the lost visions of youth, and, by anticipation, a requiem for the smith, whose shop, no doubt, will soon make way for its natural successor, a most prosaic garage. Times have indeed changed, when the children coming home from school no longer pause to look in at the open door of the smithy! Perhaps this displacement, in the mind of city childhood, of old by new interests, is indicative of the changes that have come upon many influences affecting the growing generation. Are they learning elsewhere, if not in the school, these children who never knew a real childhood, that

Thus at the flaming forge of life
Our fortunes must be wrought;
Thus on its sounding anvil shaped
Each burning deed and thought?

Perhaps, but homes and schools are among the agencies that have changed. No longer is the simile of the forge and anvil in favor with our trusted pedagogues, our indulgent parents. Love is the power that moves all things today, they argue, and through love must the little one be led to find the work in harmony with his being, and induced to move along his self-chosen line of personal development. It is very beautiful, this theory, but its adoption is one reason, perhaps, why today there are so many juvenile delinquents and why, from time to time, outraged groups of business men arise to enquire in a pained tone, why reading, writing and arithmetic have been suffered to lapse into a desuetude, certain but not innocuous.

LIMITED ANARCHY

IN an address to the New York State Teachers' Association nearly two years ago, former President Taft, speaking in his dual capacity as pedagogue and authority on constitutional law, wisely suggested that a school should not be a republic. In theory, at least, this republic derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, and it does not seem safe to base school law on this dictum of political wisdom. Most children of school age are notoriously anarchistic. They may love their teacher, and they do occasionally, not as a teacher, but as one who, having wandered into the meshes of a tyrannical system, unexpectedly retains some few amiable and human qualities. Left to their sincerest and most native impulses, they would rend the whole fabric of education, with as little compunction as Mr. Leonard D. Abbot, exclusively on paper and by word of mouth, would put an end to the Government of the United States. Yet, on analysis, a "republic" connotes not a weak, but a strong government. It cannot be republican in anything but name,

unless its citizens have learned not only to submit to authority, but to regard that authority with a certain degree of reverence. Proceeding from this concept, it would seem that some of our schools would be greatly improved by the assumption of an out-and-out republican form of government. As now conducted, they certainly do not teach obedience, and they appear to look upon reverence as a kind of weakness, incompatible with true self-respect. Their present regime, an attempt to synthesize the maximum amount of personal liberty and initiative, with just enough restraint to bar the pupil, should he proceed to eject the teacher or fire the schoolhouse, is described with some difficulty. Perhaps it is best named by saying that it is a limited anarchy.

"SOFT" EDUCATION

MR. TAFT was further pleased to suggest that too many American children do precisely what they wish. They have little discipline at home, and at school they are not compelled to apply themselves seriously to their books. Thus from both the natural founts of knowledge and training, they imbibe a certain contempt, or at best, a real lack of appreciation for the necessity of submission, and of hard intellectual work. This is an old song, chanted, no doubt, in the ears of the first school-master, yet it is no more possible to indict our whole educational system than it is to indict a whole people. There are so many exceptions that the critic will be slow to ascribe to our schools in general, faults that on closer examination may prove to be purely local. But with all due allowance made, it would seem that indictment of "softness" brought against American educational methods rests on facts of almost daily experience, noted by men and women of many professions. It may be true that under the new regime our pupils run to the schools with bright and happy faces, and that they enjoy themselves hugely from eight in the morning until four in the afternoon, in tasks largely self-chosen and of dubious educational value. If the school were synonymous with a play-house, the pleasure of the child would be a sufficient guarantee that a school of this kind was accomplishing all that could be reasonably expected. There is sound sense, however, in the assumption that the principal purpose of the school is not to amuse the pupil or simply to keep him occupied, but to train him. Judged by this criterion, the results of our public education are scarcely commensurate with the time and money spent upon it.

"PREPARING FOR LIFE"

IF the school is to train for scholarship, the pupil must be brought to know the necessity of intellectual labor, and even of that unrelieved and apparently purposeless mental toil that seems mere drudgery. If the school is to make him a good citizen, it must impress upon him the necessity of subordinating his likes and dislikes to a common authority, legislating for the common good. Labor has always meant effort, and because we are mere men, still retaining the effects of original sin, effort usually calls for sacrifice. These are qualities not acquired in a moment, and acquired with extreme difficulty unless a beginning has been made in youth; but they are qualities imperatively demanded, if the boy is to become an asset to the State instead of a liability. The weakness of much of the "new education" in these precise points was admirably set forth in an editorial published in the *Columbia State* last September:

If our lives never brought us face to face with duties other than "interesting," never imposed sheer drudgery upon us, never challenged us with knotty problems to be solved properly only by plain old-time hard thinking, then possibly the new theories would work. But the children of today are going to run against endless things to do that require disciplined will-power and a long ingrained habit of attacking and overcoming the dullest, most forbidding sort of everyday problems in life. What preparation for this is it, to ease them along in their young days, let them sidestep drudgery in studies, fill them full of the notion that it is the world's business to be "interesting" in all that it assigns

them to do? . . . Keep some rough places in school life, require more or less hard work, and thus develop driving power.

This is not popular doctrine today, but by that very fact is its necessity made manifest. "Learn, nor account the pang," counsels Browning, "dare, never grudge the throe." In this spirit of "welcome each rebuff," Charles Francis Adams used to think that a boy's dislike for a study was a very good reason why he should be constrained to apply himself to it. "But," comments the editor of the *Chicago Tribune*, "our training nowadays leads us inevitably to the conclusion that we need not beat down obstacles or break through them. If we lie down before them without making an effort, and die in our tracks, that is all that is expected of us."

JOHNNY AND MARIANNA

IT would be folly to expect much more from the boy who has been weakly allowed to reject studies which he finds difficult, and to choose such mental occupations only, as he may find congenial. This is not a caricature in these days when electivism is an accomplished fact in our academies and even in many grade schools. The school and the home are the boy's world during the most impressionable years of his life. It is nothing short of cruelty to give him a practical philosophy which must afterwards be essentially reconstructed to meet the demands of actual life, whether his ambition prompts him to become a coalheaver or a doctor of philosophy. Johnny has no taste for anything so low as vulgar fractions; he cannot even add. The conclusion drawn by the fond parent is not that Johnny shall be compelled to concentrate upon arithmetic, but that he shall be allowed to dabble with dry-batteries, since he has "a real gift for electricity." Johnny spells like Josh Billings; therefore he is allowed to throw his dictionary out of the window, and devote himself *ad lib.* to shop-work, for which he has "a perfect genius." The truth is that Johnny has a perfect genius for getting away from work, and his fond parents, with the aid of our present complacent school systems, are training Johnny to become a worthless shirker. Marianna-in-the-Eighth-Grade can concoct impossible brews and pottages in the school's model kitchen. She can, partly, trim feminine head-gear that is even more impossible. She can weave small rugs, the like of which were never seen on land or sea. She can mess up canvasses that would cause a futurist to curl up and die from envy. But her grammar is of a piece with her cooking, she adds up figures like Copperfield's Dora, and she punctuates on the bias. Her one small head cannot hold everything, and as Mr. Michael Friedsam, president of the New York mercantile house of Altman, has asked, "How can we expect our boys and girls to know the essentials when almost fifty per cent of their time in school is devoted to the recreational 'studies' which come under the head of 'fads and fancies?'"

Similar conclusions were reached by the Committee on Commercial Education of the New York State Chamber of Commerce, in a report dated April 26, 1917. To mention that this Committee has yielded somewhat to the magic spell woven by the highly-Rockefellerized Mr. Abram Flexner may not be amiss; however this may be, the conviction was recorded that "the charges of general inefficiency along the [New York public school] graduates were real and not imaginary."

The mass of graduates did not have a working knowledge of the subjects taught, and had lost, or never acquired, those traits of personal habit and character that are essential to all business, and without which education must fail. The traits referred to are truthfulness, accuracy, thoroughness, promptness, cleanliness, politeness, and the like. These traits and habits should be concomitants of all education. . . . Their lack showed that some fundamental error existed.

How hopeless is the prospect for improvement may be gathered from the fact, that this Committee finds the only remedy in the

adoption of the *mixtum-gatherum* which in New York is dignified by the name of the "duplicate school method."

AND NOW "CONCENTRATION" !

ADDRESSING the Association of Urban Universities last winter, the New York banker, Mr. Mortimer L. Schiff, remarked, "One of the greatest faults that has come under my observation is that our young people have not been taught to concentrate. It is a pity that more stress is not laid on this factor in our schools, as, in my opinion, there can be no real efficiency without it." No teacher argues that training must be dull before it can be effective, and concentration is taught more readily if the pupil can be led to take an interest in a subject of real educational worth. Yet if our boys and girls are allowed to choose their studies because they promise to be "interesting," and to drop them simply because they find them "hard," they will never learn the truth of the poet's words that our fortunes must be wrought at a flaming forge. You cannot make steel at a cold blast-furnace. No more can you form character by the soft and spineless methods called, by a grievous misuse of words, "education."

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

SOCIOLOGY

Who Is My Neighbor?

THERE was a time and an occasion when the framer of this question was merely half-hearted; he was partially poised for information and, to a certain extent, inclined to temporize. Now it is asked in a satirical sense with the intention of attracting to one phase of our lives the attention of the readers of AMERICA.

It is true that the question might have been more exactly put in this form: Where is my neighbor? Yes, where is he? Have I any in the good old-fashioned sense of the term? Am I not, surrounded though I may be by the 200,000 people of a thriving, throbbing, thrilling and thrilled Middle-West city, alone? Am I not more or less marooned in a sea of humanity, a stormy, shifting sea with whose moods I cannot successfully get acquainted because of their infinite variety?

NOT HOMES BUT HOUSES

THE American home is suffering from the operation of the inverse ratio. The more active, the more exacting our life becomes, the smaller the American home becomes. It has worked itself away from the ancestral home by degrees to the small city house, to the apartment, to the flat, to the suite, to the hotel room, to the "Murphyized" single room, where "Things are not what they seem." I venture to say that out of the 200,000 dwellers in the city of my nativity, 100,000 have no enshrined home-associations as their grandfathers had. I would venture further and say that less than that number would even wish for enshrined home-associations. They have no homes in the literal sense of possession. They have given years of their lives to the acquisition of that most easily exchangeable of assets, money. They have no house, they own no land, and mayhap have brought no children into the world. By means of a small monthly or weekly payment they have managed to get a place in which to stay the greater part of their time, but that place is not theirs. The fact of the matter is, to put it rather crudely, these thousands, by paying in dribs and drabs, provide places for themselves to stay a few hours at a time. We may have never thought about this. But an experimental trip with a shifter-from-place-to-place will be illuminating.

THE FLAT DWELLER

HENRY Who-earns-five-dollars-a-day goes forth at 7:40 in the morning and catches the 7:41 at the corner. He pays the conductor five cents and is allowed the shelter of the car until he reaches his office at 7:55. Here he stays until the sun

crosses the meridian. The inner man calls and his plaint is answered in terms of the restaurant bill of fare. Henry is allowed to tarry here a reasonable length of time because he is a purchaser. The meal fitly capped with a stogie, Henry goes forth into the streets of his city and my city for a stroll. It costs him nothing to indulge in this form of relaxation, for he does not stay. Were he to tarry, he would be urged to move on; and a disinclination to obey this urgent advice would lead to his arrest for loitering.

After all, this would be quite proper, for the city is *not* his and, after all has been said, it is *not* my city. Back to the office until 3:00, into the car, and out of it into the main lobby of that specific flat-building which bears his name in its row of mail-boxes. Henry is at home in this row of dwellings, and *row*, rhyming with *hoe*, by the oddity of the English language, may also be pronounced to rhyme with *now*. He ascends to his layer of the structure and there is greeted by his wife—merely by his wife and nobody else. Though this is what Henry is accustomed to call home, it is also—no paradox or epigram intended—an apartment. Henry may stay here without let or hindrance because he has paid his tariff thirty days in advance. His staying privilege is assured for that length of time.

MACHINE-MADE HOMES

IF Henry lives in one of those modern apartments which have been liveried and buttoned and servanted by efficiency, he becomes the temporary possessor of a mechanical contrivance, the like of which the world never saw until the dawning of the twentieth century. Tables, chairs, and similar furniture, are not his; neither are they what they seem to be. When the gloom of night comes on, transformation after transformation changes the uses and appearances of entire rooms. Morning light witnesses a precise reversal of the evening process.

Now, there is not the slightest objection to the advantages of modern appliances. Their day has come never to depart. It is useless to bemoan the comforting travel of the ox-cart when the automobile whisks the dust onto our doorsteps, and sends its perfume into our street windows. The gist of the matter lies in the fact that all that Henry sees about him, all that he uses, everything that enters into his daily life, save his clothes and his wife, is not his. His departure from this apartment and his return to it daily, mean nothing in association, save that his appearance is natty, and he says hail or farewell to his wife with a husbandly kiss. All other things are passing; they are temporary; in fine, they do not belong to him. He could leave them at any time, and no regret would fill his heart, for he could get others, perhaps even more efficient, for an equivalent payment. His life is a mechanical thing; it depends on machinery, and the machinery depends on others who own or operate it. He is not interested in the mechanism of the living process unless the dumb-waiter fails to respond, or the elevator boy loses himself in a book, or the plumbing persists in responding after demands have been satisfied. Henry, to sum up, is simply not concerned with those things which are not his.

INTEREST AND ASSOCIATION

ASSOCIATION is not a cumulative and humanizing process, unless it is backed by ownership. To claim my heart's-core interest, a thing must be mine. To mean something to me, a home must be my home, or it is likely to be a house, a dwelling, or a place-to-live-in. I am enlivened to the very depths when something that my father, or my grandfather owned, comes into my possession. It carries a world of value which would mean nothing to the auctioneer on the block, but I am satisfied with it because it has meant something to others, and it is now mine and means something to me. I admit and regret that this is not a common sentiment. If it were I would know where my neighbors were.

EDWARD F. MOHLER, M.A.

NOTE AND COMMENT

The Federation of Labor and the
Switzerland Conference

PRESIDENT GOMPERS, of the American Federation of Labor, declined to send delegates to the labor conference to be held in Switzerland in September. This conference was favored by delegates from trade unions of Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Germany, Austria, Hungary and Bulgaria. Mr. Gompers sent the following cablegram in answer to the invitation that came to America from President Lindquist of the Stockholm conference:

The executive council of the American Federation of Labor, in session, after due deliberation upon invitation received from you and from Oudegeest of Amsterdam, Holland, to send delegates to a conference proposed to be held at Stockholm September 17, decided that we regard all such conferences as premature and untimely and as leading to no good purpose. We apprehend that a conference such as is contemplated would rather place obstacles in the way of democratizing the institutions of the world, and hazard the liberties and opportunities for freedom of all peoples. Therefore, the American Federation of Labor with its 2,500,000 members cannot accept invitations to participate in such a conference. If an international trade union conference is to be held it should be at a more opportune time than the present or the immediate future, and in any event the proposals of the American Federation of Labor for international conference should receive further and more sympathetic consideration.

This cablegram was transmitted to the labor federations of France, England and Holland.

Red, White and Blue Book

THE Red, White and Blue Book, "How the War Came to America," has been issued by the Committee on Public Information at Washington. It contains twenty-three pages of historical matter with the addresses of the President to the Senate and to the Houses of Congress. The position of the United States in 1914 is summarized as follows:

(1) The Monroe Doctrine. We had pledged ourselves to defend the New World from European aggression, and we had by word and deed made it clear that we would not intervene in any European dispute. (2) The Freedom of the Seas. In every naval conference our influence had been given in support of the principle that sea law to be just and worthy of general respect must be based on the consent of the governed. (3) Arbitration. As we had secured peace at home by referring inter-State disputes to a Federal tribunal, we urged a similar settlement of international controversies. Our ideal was a permanent world court. We had already signed arbitration treaties not only with great Powers which might conceivably attack us, but even more freely with weaker neighbors in order to show our good faith in recognizing the equality of all nations both great and small.

The pamphlet outlines the events leading up to the entrance of the United States into the war. The state of affairs at the time of the delivery of the President's war message is explained and the course of the President and the nation justified by the recital of facts now known to all.

Tuberculosis as Deadly
as War

AT the last session of the New York State legislature an important statute on tuberculosis was enacted. The attention of county Boards of Supervisors was called to this law by Governor Whitman, in his capacity as Chairman of the State Council of Defense:

The experience of all European countries since the beginning of the present war has shown that the increased prevalence of tuberculosis constitutes one of the most serious problems of the war. The French authorities estimate that

150,000 men have been returned from the trenches with active tuberculous disease. The conditions in Austria-Hungary and Russia, and to a somewhat less extent in Germany, have been similar. In view of this situation and of the certainty of our being required to provide for our own tuberculous soldiers returning to their homes, the legislature has felt that every locality in the State should undertake to do its part and should provide accommodations for the care of its own tuberculous soldiers as well as its own tuberculous citizens. It may be noted in this connection that all of the institutions for tuberculosis existing in France before the war have been taken over solely for the care of tuberculous soldiers.

It is reported that as many Canadians have been killed by tuberculosis since the beginning of the war as have been killed in battle. Yet tuberculosis is a preventable disease.

Children's Play

THE report of the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor contains a plea for the continuance of public provision for recreation for the young people of our cities. The Chief of the Children's Bureau, Miss Julia C. Lathrop, made her appeal on patriotic grounds:

An English authority has lately pointed out the demoralization to boys and girls caused by the breaking down of clubs and the withdrawal to the army of recreation leaders, and he has traced much of the increase in juvenile delinquency in England to the chaos in recreation activities which has prevailed since the war. This is a good time to remind ourselves that the continuance and development of all types of innocent and healthful recreation in every community offer a call to patriotic service for many who cannot go to the front. The strain and anxiety which are certain to grow in this country for an indefinite period ahead of us need to be counterbalanced by greater community effort to provide opportunity for wholesome play.

The need of safeguarding our children from well-meaning patriots who would burden them with farm labor or industrial work during war-time can be seen from the hysteria that seized upon some of our legislators at the beginning of the war. Before the war was five weeks old, four States gave officials or commissions power to suspend the labor laws during the war-period and only the Governor's veto saved the labor laws of New York State. To weaken the children of today is to harm the nation for the years to come.

Large Families and
Longevity

THE *Journal of Heredity* in its July issue gives a report from Dr. Alexander Bell that will be disheartening to the preachers of birth-control:

Those who preach birth-control are responsible for the idea that large families are an evil. This idea is false and dangerous. For the sake of eugenics it is important that it be not spread. . . . In Dr. Bell's table 2,964 individuals are dealt with. In 41 "only child" cases, a majority died young. The bigger the family the better off are its members, if survival beyond the age of twenty be the measurement. Small families make the poorest showing under all conditions; their members are handicapped at all ages. The larger families, those around ten children, make the best showing at all ages, few of their members dying young and many living to old age. If superior parents want a large family they ought not to be discouraged by the widespread but false idea that every child beyond the second or third is likely to be progressively handicapped. The really important factor in determining a child's vitality is not the number of brothers and sisters who have preceded him, but the kind of stock he comes from.

While the viewpoint adopted applies equally well to the stock-farm, here is crushing proof against the blatant birth-control advocates who constantly appeal to nature, while ignoring nature's God.